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## มddenda.

PP. LL. CC. VV.
[Add:-J.D. Michaelis, Lesearten der Consonanten sowohl als der Punkte, welche er in der deutschen Übersetzung dem gedruckten Text vorgezogen hat oder gleich schätzet in Neue orientalische und exegetische Bibliothek, Part 7, pp. 168 ff . - P. H.]
${ }_{32,26}(\mathbf{1}, 1)$ On the strophic division of the Prologue to Proverbs $c f$. the views of D. H. Müller in his Strophenbau in den Proverbien (Vienna, 1901) pp. ii ff. He divides $\mathrm{I}, 8-19$ into a two line introduction and two five line stanzas, substituting for אם יאמרו [אליך[
 not stated to what end the sinners try to mislead us. This warning is not introduced before the beginning of the second stanza (vv. 15 ff.).

Ibid., pp. 4 ff. c. 5 is divided into three seven line stanzas and $I_{5}$ one final three line stanza, the introduction ( vv .1 .2 ) being considered a part of the first stanza.

Ibid., pp. vii ff. c. 8 is divided into three double stanzas and one final single stanza, each of five lines. To obtain this he omits v. II (as the gloss of a reader from $3,14 \mathrm{f}$.), $13^{\mathrm{a}}$ (so, too, Bickell), 20
 $32^{\text {b }}$, then $34^{\text {b.c }} \& \mathrm{cc}$.
33,13 ( 6) [Contrast my paper The Beginning of the Babylonian Nimrod Epic in vol. 22 of the Journal of the American Oriental Society (New Haven, 1901).
40 ( 8) Cf. DuHm's commentary on Jeremiah (Tübingen, 1901) p. 365.
35,22 ( 2,7 ) See Dr. K. J. Grimm's paper on $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ (in 38 ,21 ( 5,18 ) Cf. p. 75, 1. 36. JAOS 22.

52,15 (19,8) Cf. also Hos. 12,3 וריב ליהוה עם ישראהא ולפקד על יעקב בדוכיו; see Dr. K. J. Grimm's dissertation Euphemistic Liturgical Appendixes 30 in the OT (Baltimore, 1901) p. 76; cf. also Ges.-KautzSCh, § 114, p.
$62,16(26,8)$ Geo. Beer in his review of Toy's Commentary on Proverbs (Theol. Literaturzeitung 26,287 (May 25 'or) suggests מרגלית ארגל $=$ $\mu$ aprapitns pearl for all (he who honors a fool is like a man who mixes up pearls with stones). He raises the question whether 35 $\mu \alpha \rho y a p i t n s$ is not a Semitic loanword.
48 (23) The Syriac term for litharge is ${ }^{\text {( }}$ /foses. - P. H.]
 voûs emirvúuwv and a beggar has no judicious understanding presupposes eng in the beginning for fill ע eq. This change, however, must not be considered, with JÄG., as a transcriptional error, but, with LAG., as an intentional alteration (cf. above, $p .70,1.16$ ). It is an example of the frequent playing with texts on the formula, Read not this but that, and does not involve any real textual variant. We may therefore pass over Baumg.'s remark that may be a misunderstanding of the abbreviation 'by for and that the second rendering is in accordance with the translator's usual method rather than the first.
(25) The third and fourth hemistich s in ©:


are evidently a parallel to $\mathrm{v}, 25^{\mathrm{a} \cdot \mathrm{b}}$ :

 According to L.AGARDE both translations are by the first translator who, after
having joined $25^{\mathrm{a}}$ to $25^{\mathrm{b}}$, translated the whole v .25 a second time. But it is difficult to see what led him to do anything of the kind. It is much more natural to suppose that the object of the second translation, i.e. $625^{\mathrm{c} . \mathrm{d}}$, was a more exact rendering of $\mathbf{~ I I}$. LAG. himself admits that $\dot{\sigma} \epsilon^{\prime} \beta \in l a$ is intended to render 20



26 In the recently found Hebrew fragments of Sir. these words run as follows:-

Schechter and Taylor, The Wisdom of Ben Sira (Cambridge, 1899) print on
 crossed out and not simply marked as delendum by a superimposed dot (cf. Crit. Notes on the Psalms, p. 80, 1. 33). This $\kappa$ is, of course, nothing but a transcriptional error due to the $\mathbb{N}$ in the following I would therefore read simply בשׁ. The two dots above the $\uplus$ and $\mathcal{Z}$ in the original are placed a little more toward the left; they represent, of course, the ain of the initial hand the diacritical point of the $\psi$ (contrast Ges. Kauțzsch, $\int 8, \mathrm{~g}$ ). Both dots as well as the io biso under the $\Psi$ were added by a later hand to avoid all possible misunderstanding. Schechter and Taylor translate this on p. xviii:-

> For there is a shame (i) that ladeth with iniquity; and there is a shame that is honor and grace.

 fem. part. Hif. of אשג to pronounce (cf. Crit. Notes on Numbers, p. 57, 1.8) for
 on the Text (p.41) Schechter and Taylor remark on nix: "The dot indicates that the letter is to be canceled. For פבוד וחן, of. $\psi 84$, 12." Cf. also Ryssel in 20 Theol. Studien und Kritiken, 1900, p. 375. We cannot explain why this quotation was introduced in this passage; Toy suggests that it may be due to a Christian scribe.

27 (20) After v. 20, and in very loose connection with it, $\mathfrak{G}$ adds:-


He who stares with his eye is an abomination to JHVH; and fools are of impudent tongue.
Ew. (p. 235) and Dke. agree in retranslating (cf. 16, 30):-
רועבת יהוה עצהּ עיניו וכסילים פַּ לשון
Here and in v. 21, if anywhere, we may háve some original lines of Proverbs which have been lost in Al .


The heart of the wicked seeks evil; but an honest heart seeks after knowledge.
Ew. (p. 236) retranslates these lines as follows:-
while Delitzsch renders:-
On the probable genuineness of this off. above on v. 20 (1.32).
 p. $65,11.25$ ff. So much is certain that this hemistich is not "a third corruption 45 of $\mathfrak{A l}$ Ioc" but an expansion of $\mathrm{v} .10^{\mathrm{c}}$ into a beb, which may be even original.
(17) After v. $17 \sqrt{6}$ adds a variant of 29,17 and 18 a. But the difference between the third hemistich in the addition here $\left(28,17^{\circ}\right)$ and $29,18^{a}$ is so great that it is doubtful whether they are renderings of the same original. In $\mathscr{G}^{\mathrm{V}} 28,17^{\mathrm{c}}$ runs as follows: - oủ $\mu \boldsymbol{\eta}$ útakoúons ( (6Sc.a úmakoúvel, which Del. translates: : 50 ם ע (
 not away as a leader for godless people.
$25,9-26,11$
 tenth, point to a Hebrew original, which is restored by Del., beginning from the third hemistich, as follows:-

But the last line here says the opposite of the Cireck text; we should probably render: לבלתי דעוּת.

In his /alirbiucher für Bibl. Wiss., II (1863) pp. I8ff., Ew. regarded these verses as an original element in Proverbs, adding a retranslation into Hebrew; but in the second edition of his Salomonische Silviften (Göttingen, 1867) there is not a word about them, so he seems to have himself given up all belief in their originality: Certainly, both the structure, with its lack of exact parallelism or clean cut antithesis, and the thought, with its wild and in part absurd exaggerations in the sixth hemistich, are at variance with the spirit of the Hebrew Book of Proverbs. BAUMG. finds additional arguments against the originality of this section in the prolix development of the same thought and in the fact that these verses are omitted in the other Versions.

25 (9) The omission of $9^{a}$ in 6 is to be explained by homaoteleuton: the translator passed over from 7 at the end of v. 8 to 7 at the end of v. 9.
(10) (5) adds after $10^{\mathrm{b}}$, The hostility and cnmity to thee will not pass azeay, four hemistichs:- $\quad \alpha \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ Éбтal ool lon $\theta$ avditu.


 but will be to thee like unto death.
Favor and friendship make free;
preserve them for thyself, that thou mayest not incur reproaches. Guard thy ways rather, easy of intercourse.
Ew. thinks from the bad Greek of these verses that they have been translated from Hebrew, but attempts no retranslation. According to Del. the original ran as follows:- בית
אך שמר דרפּך בערבוּת צפשו
(20) After v. 20 (6) adds this לשט:-



> As the moth in a garment and the worm in wood, so grief eats out the heart of man.

It can hardly be doubted that this is based on a Hebrew original, though it may have been added later on account of its affinity in thought with v .20 . Ewald (p. 224) translates:-1ב וחונת איש מכח



26 (II) After V. II 6 adds a which was recognized by JÄG. to be identical with Sir. 4,21 (in Sir., however, these lines are joined to v. 20 with Eotiv rdip): -

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { кai Éativ aioxúvn, óza kal xdpis. }
\end{aligned}
$$

There is a shame which brings sin,
and there is a shame which leads to honor and favor.
as Hebrew original: - דור ורדֶ, but considered this hemistich a variant translation of $\mathrm{V} .19{ }^{\mathrm{b}}$; BAUMG., on the other hand, thinks it is a gloss to 18,16 . Following Hitz, the second hemistich has been generally regarded as a variant translation of 1,19 (את בפש בעליו י). But this cannot possibly mean and con-
quers the soul of him who receives the gift (EW.); it can only mean but ( $\mu$ évгou) it snatches away the life of its possessor ( 6 wrongly takes בעליי as a real plural; see, however, above, p. 34, l. 31). In $\mathbf{1}, 19$ this is at once plain, for there the seeking of illegal gain is the grammatical subject; בעליץ refers to him who is guilty of this striving after unjust lucre. In this passage, on the other hand, it must refer to him who seeks to give bribes and thus endangers his life, viz., if he is caught by a just judge. It cannot refer to him who receives bribes; cf. above, Ew.'s translation (p.81, 1.52) and 3 animam autem aufert accipientium. It cannot be denied that this interpretation is somewhat artificial; nevertheless it is far more probable than to supply, with Del., as subject to apaıefital, covetousness in opposition to munificence.
(II) For the hemistich missing in ft after v. $1 I^{\text {a }}$ cf. above, p. 54, 11. 44 ff .
(14) After v. 14 all texts of $(5$ read the following addition:-


There are evil ways before a man $\mid$ and he hates to turn from them; | but from a crooked and evil way one ought to turn. Form and thought show that we have here no verse but a prosaic gloss (to v. I4?). Nevertheless it is probable, especially on account of $\dot{\varepsilon} v \dot{u} m i o v a v \delta \rho o ́ s, ~ t h a t ~ t h e ~ g l o s s ~ l a y ~ b e f o r e ~ © ~ i n ~ a ~ H e b r e w ~$ garb. According to Del. the Hebrew original ran: -

23 (23) V. 23 is lacking in (5. Its originality, at least in the present context, is certainly dubious, since it breaks the connection between vv. 22 and 23 ff . In ( $\mathbf{6 C o m p l}$. \&cc. this verse is added as usually from $\Theta$.
24 (22) After v. 22 ( 5 adds several hemistichs, ten to eleven in number according as the






 бưv vєúpots ảvӨpúumous àvaגíซкєı,



A son who keeps the word of God will be kept from destruction. ................. (beyond translation)
By no tongue shall a lie be said to the king,
and no manner of lie shall pass his tongue.
The king's tongue is a sword and not of flesh, and whoever is given over to it will be shattered.
For when his wrath is violently excited, it consumes men and their sinews. and burns them up as with fire, so that they are uneatable for young eagles.

19 The first forms an independent whole which no doubt goes back to a Hebrew original. Ew.'s restoration of that original (p. 883) runs:-

דעת טוכ ליודע תקרב ואיצ תבונה יטצאנה:
Del.'s rendering probably comes nearer the original text:-
שַׁבל פוב יקרב ליורעיו ואיש תבונה ימצאנוּ
The second טשל is very difficult, and the above translation is only an attempt. The text is evidently very corrupt. Only one thing seems certain, namely that the last hemistich is intended to correspond to the superfluous third hemistich
 ed. But the principal difficulty lies in the fact that this last hemistich contains io neither a sequel nor an antithesis to the preceding, probably owing to the corruption of the latter. Ew. (p. 184) conjectured that the original ran:-

He who has too many friends has much evil;
and he who pursues words will not be saved.
i. e., he who pursues the empty nords of hypoiritical friemds. But this interpretation is artificial and forced in the highest degree. Nor is Del.'s restoration, proposed on p. 14 of the introduction to his Commentary, any better:-


> He who is the friend of many will be rewarded with cvil; he who pursues words will not be saved.

On p. 307 of Del.'s Commentary this last hemistich is explained to mean that courting the friendship of as many as possible is a pursuit of words which mean nothing and lead to nothing. On p. 545 Drel. gives as a literal translation of the


20 (14) VV. 14-19 are lacking in 6 ; in Cod. 23 of H-P and some minuscules (cf. above, p. $80,1.41$ ) they are added from $\Theta$. The omission of these verses is probably due to the insertion of vv. 20-22 in (6) after v. 9 (so TOY).

25 (5) V. 5 is lacking in (5 for no apparent reason; the addition in Cod. 23 of H-P and 6 minuscules is taken again from $\theta$ ( $c f$. above, 1.28).
(18) V. $18^{\text {b }}$ ( 5 ; the addition in Cod. 23 of II-P and some minuscules kai avti eủotewv doúv $\theta \in \tau \circ \varsigma$ (alii doúvetos or $\pi \alpha \rho \dot{\alpha} v o \mu \circ \varsigma$ ), which corresponds exactly to Al , is according to LaG, due to a later hand.

22 (6) V. $6, \wedge$, is added again from $\theta$ in Cod. 23 of H-P and some minuscules.
(8) After v. 8 © adds two hemistichs:-


The first hemistich is a more exact (and therefore probably later) though not entirely literal translation of $v .9^{\text {a }}$, i. e., a doublet of the freer translation which follows. The second hemistich, on the other hand, is a doublet of the translation of $\mathrm{v} .8^{\text {b }}$, the only difference being that the translator read, and rendered by
 which, however, is unknown to the OT; BAUMC. thought that it was
 $\psi 25$ (쎄 26), 4 \&c.
(9) After v. 9 (6 again has two additional hemistichs:-

17 (6) After v. 6 © \& c. (in ©A \&c. after v. 4) adds this double hemistich:-
 то0 đè á ariotou oủdé óbo\ó̧.
To the faithful belongs the whole world of treasures; but to the unfaithful not an obolos.
LAG. considers this distich to be a transformation of v. 7; it was read:-

and in translating it the order of the hemistichs was inverted. But this hypothesis is so artificial that it has rightly met with no acceptance. It is another question whether this verse ever had a Hebrew original. Ew. (p. 171) thought it io had, and translated back (reading $\dot{\alpha} \pi \lambda \eta^{n} \sigma \tau 0 u$ for $\dot{a}$ riotou, following 28,25 ):

DeL., on the other hand, rendered:-
למאמין כל אוצָרות עילם ולאשר אינבו מאטין אף לא אבזרה:
But both translations cover up the strangeness of the expression § kó хø $\uparrow \mu \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega v$, Ew, rendering $\kappa \delta \sigma \mu \mu \rho$ by the obscure [cf. Crit. Notes on Ezekiel, p. 85, I. 39. - P. H.], while DeL. arbitrarily inverts nomen regens and nomen rectum. Tov may be right in maintaining that the form is Greek. A reason for the addition cannot be discovered, unless it be that mofd re-occurs in v. 7 .
 ing this antithesis to $21^{\text {b }}$, our opinion is the same as in the case of the addition to 17,5 (see above p. 79, 1. 52). In Hebrew this hemistich would run: -
(cf. 10, 1).
I8 (8) Instead of v .8 (6 has, as JÃG. recognized, a variant to the translation of $19,15.25$ The thought is akin to that of $\mathfrak{M} \mathbf{1 8 , 9}$ but not to $\mathbf{1 8}, 9$ in $\mathfrak{G}$. The anticipation of 19,15 in this passage is, therefore, just as inexplicable as the omission of 18,8 ; this latter verse joins well to 18,7 and can hardly be a later addition.
(22) After v. 22 (6) adds the following double hemistich:-


He who casts off a good wife casts off good, and he who retains an adulteress is foolish and godless.
Lag. rightly considers this to be a transformation of v. 22, which was added to the Hebrew text. Al מצא אצשה טצא טוב suggested to the glossator the word-play מוציא אמשה טובה מוציא טוב; and, as Toy remarks, b is the natural antithesis. Quite uncalled for is Ew.'s hypothesis that this verse was added by a later hand in order to reduce the apparently too great praise of wives. Del. recognized that the glossator was led by מעוציא מצא, nevertheless he trans-


[^0]
$\qquad$





$\qquad$
$\square$



\author{[^1]}

(


$-$35 KV. 40
(23ff.) VV. 18,23-19,2 are lacking in $(\mathfrak{F}$; in Cod. 23 of $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{P}$ and some minuscules they
have been added from $\Theta$.
(23 ff.) VV. $18,23-19,2$ are lacking in $(\mathfrak{\sigma}$; in Cod. 23 of $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{P}$ and some minuscules they
have been added from $\Theta$.
19 (7) After v. $7^{\text {a,b }}$ (5 adds two משלים:-




:

DEL.'s rendering of the three last is: -

| וגבר |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |

[For preferable see above, p. 44, 1. 16. - P. H.]
(17) After $17^{\text {a }}{ }^{6}$ adds three hemistichs:-



and ways of righteousness bring long life.
He who accepts chastisement will be happy,
and he who heeds rebukes will become wise.
Ew. regarded this as the original text, out of which the present text was shorten- 15 ed by $17^{\text {bee }} d$ being dropped because the combination of the first and the last hemistichs $\left(17^{\mathrm{a}}\right.$ and ${ }^{\text {e }}$ ) formed a suitable beb. That the intervening lines in (5 are hated on a Hebrew original can hardly be doubted. Del. raised the objection against their genuineness in the present context that all the ideas in the additional hemistichs had already occurred, but this argument would apply to many passagres in fl . A more valid objection might be found in the fact that we have in 5 a double translation of $1117^{\mathrm{b}}$. Consequently (6's arrangement of v. 17 in three double hemistichs could only be made when the double translation of $17^{b}$ was already in existence; otherwise one hemistich would have been lacking. According to EW. (p. 167) the Hebrew original of (5 $17^{\text {b.c.d }}$ was:-

##  <br>  <br> 

The original translation of $17^{b}$ was, as LAG. recognized, the hemistich standing second in all texts ( $17^{\text {e }}$ in (6): - aramûv סè Zwìv auto peloctal otónatos 30
 preceding, more exact translation certainly read originally $\delta \in \in$ before $\varphi \cup \lambda d \sigma \sigma \in$, but this had to be struck out when the three preceding hemistichs had been inserted after $17^{2}$ so that $\delta \varsigma \varphi u \lambda \alpha \sigma \sigma \epsilon!$ came to stand at the beginning of the first hemistich of a מששל (BAUMG.).
(26) In place of $26^{\mathrm{b}}$ (6) has two hemistichs, the first of which, кai Exßldĭ́єtal Euutoû
 be regarded as the translation of m . According to Lac, the following hemistich
 the first translator, "who, in the fashion of a midrash, developed statement and contradiction out of the hemistich." But there is no contradiction in the exact sense in this case; besides, the same translatot, after having read 17 שידו in $26^{b}$, could not read $1 \pi \times$ in $26^{c}$. This third hemistich can, therefore, only be the gloss of some one who intended to give a more exact translation of $26^{\text {b }}$, based on the reading פיTו.
(30) The superfuous third hemistich, outos кáuvós Eotıv какias ( $=$ a belonged, it may be supposed, to $v .27^{a}$, where it was superseded by $\delta$ púoбєt ย์utụ̂ kakd, i. e. כעา (JÄG., LAG.).
 In this case the addition of an antithesis after the fashion of a midrash is conceivable (see above, 1. fo), and it may even, perhaps, have stood already in the Hebrew text of the translator (according to DEL. $=$ a
 parallel translation of $14,35^{\text {b }}$（Lag．）；only the translator read instead of （JÄG．）．Delitzsch，on the other hand，presupposes as the Hebrew original：－ תותה גם תאֵּד נבונים


 to have been the original reading．The younger and more exact version，which


（18）Of the two translations in $\sqrt[6]{ }$ of this verse the first，by its greater exactness，shows itself to be the younger which was subsequently added by a reviser．The second $\mu \alpha к \rho о ́ \theta \cup \mu о \varsigma ~ д ̀ v \eta ̀ \rho ~ к \alpha \tau \alpha \sigma \beta є ́ \sigma \epsilon \iota ~ к р і \sigma є ı \varsigma, ~$

transposes the two hemistichs．BAUMG．holds that this was done first by a 15 clumsy compiler；but if this conjecture were correct this verse would have a


（31）This verse was originally lacking in $\mathfrak{G}$ ，but a reason for its omission cannot be discovered．In Cod． 23 of $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{P}$ and in a number of minuscules it is inserted ac－ 20



16 （I）In place of the first three verses of this chapter $(5$ reads in some MSS after 15，33：一
 каі êvavat Kupiou［то0 Өєo0］єúpグбєıs Xápıv．
Then in all MSS：－


Finally after v． 5 （which however，according to LAG．，is a subsequent addition 30 in $\left(\boldsymbol{6}\right.$ ，put together from $11,20^{2}$ and $21^{2}$ ）：－



The greater thou art，the more do thou humble thyself；
then wilt thou find grace before JHVH．
All the works of the humble are open before God， but the godless will perish on an evil day．
The beginning of the good way is the doing of that which is right； this is better pleasing to God than slaughtering of sacrifices．
He who seeks JHVH，will find knowledge and justice， and they who seek Him uprightly，will find peace．
The substitution for At $16,1-3.5$ of four entirely different משלים was evidently due to the confusion which must have existed in the Hebrew text from which $(\mathbb{5} 45$ was translated．In（6 these verses are arranged as follows（but with several variations in different MSS）：$-15,27 ; 16,6 ; 15,28 ; 16,7 ; 15,29 ; 16,8.9 ; 15,30$ ； 32,33 ；then the two first of the above טשלים；then 16,5 and thereafter the two other משלים．Nevertheless we cannot doubt that these four are based on a Hebrew original，though it may have been somewhat younger than $\mathfrak{A l} 16,1-3$ ． According to Ew．this Hebrew text may have run as follows：－

12 (26) After v. $26^{\mathrm{a}} \mathrm{\sigma A}^{\mathrm{A}}$ \&c. (but not $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\mathrm{V}}$ ) add:-

LaG. sees in this, no doubt rightly, the original translation of $v, 10^{b}$. Then
 dúéeral xaxa. That this hemistich comes from $13,21^{a}$ is certified by the fact that in $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\mathrm{S}}$ and some minuscules $13,21^{\mathrm{b}}$ is further added.

 hemistich here takes ravon erroneously as subject; nevertheless it may be the 10 work of the first translator (so LAG.).
(9) After this verse ©AV (3 after v. 13) add:-

For the second hemistich of., with LAG., $\psi 37$ ( $\sqrt{(56), 21^{b}:-\delta \delta \dot{E} \text { Sixalos oik- } 15}$ reipet kai ठıঠoî. Ew. (p. 148) translates this addition:-
נפש מרטה תועֲה בחטאת וצדּיק חונן ומלוֶה:

A connection with vv. 9 or 10 cannot be established, TOY remarks, The couplet is not improbably a combination of glosses.
 evidently only a misplaced variant to $9^{\text {a }}$ (see above), following $\psi 112$ ( 1111 ),5:

(13) After v. $13 \mathbf{5} 9$ add three hemistichs:-
vị̂ ठo入ị oű




The content suggests $\mathbf{1 7 , 2}$ (Ew.), and a Hebrew original is very probable. Toy 30 says, This is apparently a scribal addition, taken, perhaps, from some current collection of proverbs.
 word the addition in 9,10 . The addition here is intended to explain what is


14 (22) All MSS offer a double translation. First, a younger:$\pi \lambda a v \dot{\mu} \mu \in v o t ~ \tau \epsilon к т a i v o v \sigma ı ~ к а к \alpha ́, ~$



which can be recognized again as the older by its deviating further from ft . In this second case the translator probably read:-

## : טוב

Can we regard this as the original text, or is it mercly due to ditograplyy of 45 תמא Ton? The latter view is the more probable one, unless now ton were arbitrarily supplied from the second hemistich in order to provide an object for ษサי. On the other hand, 'שרׁל may possibly be original (cf. above, p. 47, 1. 42).

 to a Christian who had in mind Luke 16,19-31; 10,42. For Ev Evठ́iq Lag. conjectured $\in v$ boúnn; it may have come from the lost second hemistich (aronbl.


9 best escaped, and thereafter (perhaps by another hand) a positive admonition is added on the model of $5,15 \mathrm{ff}$, strengthened with the promise of $9, \mathrm{II}$.

10 (4) After 10,4 (but in Cod. 23 of $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{P}$ and in some minuscules before the addition


A well trained son will be wise, and the fool will he use as a servant. According to Ew, the Hebrew original ran perhaps as follows:-
בן מוסר חכם יהיה ואויל כעבד בידו

The connection of this with v. 4 is loose, but it probably had a Hebrew io original which was added by some transcriber on the margin.

II (3) VV. $3^{\text {b }}$ and 4 are lacking in ( $\mathfrak{F}$; in their place V . $10^{\mathrm{b}}$ is inserted (JãG., LAG.); in most MSS ( $6 \mathrm{AS} \& \mathrm{c}$.) the gap is filled by an insertion after v. 2 (in some before v . 5) from 0 . Since $\mathrm{Al}_{\text {I }}^{\text {IT, according to the parallelism, seems to mean } 15}$ alms (so LaG.) the omission of v. 4 may be regarded, with Heidenh. and Baumg., as a protest against the doctrine of merit from good works; cf. above, p. 4I, 1. 36.
(10) For the omission of $v v .10^{a}$ and $11^{b}$ in $\sqrt{6}\left(10^{b}\right.$ was inserted in the place of v. 4; see above 1. 13) and the filling of the gap from $\theta$, of. above p. 44, ll. 44 ff .
(16) The plus in $\left(6\right.$ between $A{ }^{\prime} 6^{\mathrm{a}}$ and ${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ has been accepted in our text; see p .9 , zo 11. 39 and 4 I and cf. p. 44, 11. 50ff. BAUMG., however, explains it as an addition by the translator who, not recognizing the parallelism between $16^{a}$ and ${ }^{b}$ in $\not \approx$, tried to help it out. Toy also doubts the originality of ©'s text on the ground that throne is used nowhere else of a person. In this, however, he has not taken account of Is. 22,23 (כבס כ כ כ which was probably in the mind of the author of $16^{\text {b.c. }} 25$

 3 renders this literally, qui suavis est in vini demorationibus, in suis munitionibus relinquit contumeliam. According to Ew. (p. 141) the Hebrew original was 30 perhaps:-


The strangeness of the Greek expressions point to a Hebrew original, i.e. to an illustrative quotation on the margin of the MS from which the Greek was translated. This was not, however, an exemplifying gloss on $\mathrm{v} . \mathrm{I}^{\mathrm{b}}$ but stood in some
 ovv occurs again in V. $12^{\text {b }}$, and DEL. is certainly on the right track in presupposing מצצודורת in v. 12) as its Hebrew equivalent. But whether ( $611 \mathrm{I}^{\mathrm{c}, \mathrm{d}}$ is an attempt to restore $\mathrm{v}, 12$ in Al after it had become illegible and unintelligible (cf. above, p. 7I, 1. 28), or is simply a gloss caused by tisb, we cannot venture 40 to decide.

 According to Ew. (p. 143) the Hebrew original was:-

רך עין יְרחם ומקִדם בשָׁערים יצּיל נמשות:
He who is kind-hearted, will find compassion; he who is helpful in the gates, will deliver souls. But the rendering of ekө入i $\psi \in ⿺$ by bse is very arbitrary, and we should rather expect an antithesis. Del.'s rendering is certainly better, which

Here Del. takes ונוְש בשערים in the sense he who carries on a lazu-suit and re-50 gards נפשו (crushes himself) as possible in place of The proverb is most probably based on a Hebrew original, but how it came into its present context is inexplicable.

Who props himself on lies hunts the weind, I he porswes fluttering birds; 11 for he abondoned the zerels of his aineyard I and wedndired from the puths of his farmland; $\cup$ he strays through waterless wastes $\mid$ and a land in regions of thirst; | and he gather's with his hands unfruitfulness. According to EW. (p. 125) the


 ואסף בידיו נלמור
DEL., on the other hand, rendered it:-

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ותועה בנת׳בוח שָׁרַהוּ } \\
& \text { וארץ יסורה לצִּסָאון: } \\
& \text { דנשען בשׁקר ירעה רוד } \\
& \text { בי עוב שבילי כרטו }
\end{aligned}
$$

ואוסף ביּ וּ וֹר

Here, too, the possibility of a Hebrew original cannot be denied. In form and content these verses have real life and weight. But they are certainly not the original sequel of $\mathfrak{H} \mathbf{v}$. 12 . They appear to have been added (perhaps as an illustrative quotation) by a later sage in order to warn the disciples of that true wisdom, which springs from the fear of JHVH ( $c f . v .10$ ), to keep aloof from false and lying wisdom (above all, probably, from heathen philosophy), which promises satisfaction but brings only sad disappointment.
(18) 6 adds four double hemistichs:-






ǐva по入ùv Zท่ซŋุร x $\rho$ óvov,


Dut flee, linger not in the place, I nor let thine eye drivell on her; II for son pussiest 35
thou through strange water I and over a strange river. II From strange water abide thou far I and from a strange fountain drink not, || that much time thou mayest liere I and that years of life may be added to thec. The Hebrew original ran according to EW. (p. 126):

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ולא תשית עיניך בער: }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { וְיוסיפו לך שך שות חיים: }
\end{aligned}
$$



```
פי בן תעצר בנהר
```




Ded. renders (p. 543): -


## וּ וֹ <br> ועיוּ

:
רחתקּנא טמטים זרים

The last line agrees exactly with Ew.'s translation.
That these lines are based on a Hebrew original must be admitted. But they 50 are certainly the addition of some one who missed an express statement of how dangerous the counsel of Folly in v. 17 must be. Advice is therefore first given in four hemistichs how the danger of being led astray by the adulteress may be

 which subsequently pushed its way into the text, is later and more exact.


 This verse has undeniably a Hebrew flavor, and Ew. held that its original ran:- בני פַּבד את יהוה וחצנp
He was inclined to insert this after v. 3 on account of its breaking the connection 10 so badly between vv. I and 2. More probably this verse is a protest on the part of some reader, Hebrew or Greek, against the overemphasis upon a human command as opposed to the fear of God which should alone be considered.
(25) The second hemistich in this verse, which is lacking in $\llbracket^{\mathrm{V}}$, is supplied by $\sigma_{\mathrm{S}} \mathrm{C}, \mathrm{aA}$
 Cod. Syr.-Hexapl., p. 576.

8 (21) (f) adds:-


If I declare to you what takes place from day to day,
This may be based on a Hebrew original. According to Ewald (p. 122) it ran:- אם אגּיד לכם אשר ליום יום
while Del. (p. 543) renders it:-
בי אבּּד לכם את אשר יקרה יום יום אוכר מה למֵפר מעולם:
But it is certainly only an addition for the purpose of facilitating the transition from the section which described $\tau \dot{\alpha} \kappa \alpha \theta^{\prime} \hat{\eta} \mu \epsilon^{\prime} \rho \alpha v \gamma i v o ́ \mu \in v \alpha$ (vv, 1-21) to that on $\tau$ 文 $\ddagger \xi$ aîwvos (vv. 22 ff ); so BAUMGARTNER.
(29) The omission of $\mathrm{v} .29^{\mathrm{a}}$ in $\sqrt{6}$ can be due to accident only. The insertion in $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\mathrm{S}} \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{aA}$
 ros $\alpha u \tau t 00$ is derived from $\Theta$.



 may be explained on the supposition that to the above free rendering, as so often, a correction kal $Z \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \tau \epsilon$ was added. From this arose by error $\bar{\eta} \eta \tau \eta \dot{\sigma} \alpha \tau \epsilon$, and then the necessary object was added in the form of ppóvnotv. This hypothesis would seem to be simpler than Lag.'s that $\varphi \rho o$ ón $\eta$ oiv, originally a gloss to 40
 had then, for the sake of sense, been changed by a reviser to $\bar{\eta} \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \alpha \tau \epsilon$.
(Io) The addition in (fo to rà rewovar vómov stavoias eotiv araents for to know the Lazv is (the test of) true knowledge (according to DeL., p. 543,= לדעת תורה שַׁמ
(עו) cannot be regarded as a second, and still less, with LAG., BAUMG., as the 45 authentic translation of $\mathfrak{A} \mathrm{I}^{\mathrm{b}}$. It is rather the gloss of some transcriber for whom all wisdom and knowledge of God was comprised in the study and knowledge of the Law.
(12) Between vv. 12 and 13 (5 adds: -



and on p. 543 he renders more literally:-

According to Ewald (Spriche Salomo's², p. 94) the Hebrew text read as


ותוא יִישר מענליך ותליכותיך בשלום יִנִחֵם:
We doubt, however, whether these two erses are derived from a Hebrew original: the first contains a gloss on $\left\{127^{a}\right.$ in which right and left is interpreted ethically and made to apply to the right and to the crooked ways; the second, on the other hand, is a dogmatic correction (of. above, p. 70, 1. 16) of Al 26 where man is commanded to remove his foot from evil, and consequently looked upon as capable of molding aright his own ways. LaG.'s suggestion deserves consideration that it was a Greek speaking Christian who, having in mind the much discussed doctrine of the two ways, first added these words.

 freely expanded in order to bridge the chasm between vv .2 and 3 of Al .
 which is probably the original rendering, takes $y$ in the sense among and ${ }^{\prime} \boldsymbol{w}^{2}$ Did paraphrase of a personal adjective, dissolute (cf. Ges.-KAUTZSCH, $\$ 152, \mathrm{u}$ ). The second, kai evidently substituted for the original outos in order to obtain a better connection) ¿ँmúגєто oi uqpoouvviv, is a later correction which was subsequently inserted after $23^{\text {b }}$.

6 (8) After v. 8 (6) has a long addition which may perhaps be divided, with Swetie,






Or go to the bee, I and learn how diligent she is, I and how nobly she does her work. II Kings and people use her labors for their health, I and with all she is 35 honored and beloved. || Although weak in strength, she is highly esteemed, I because she honors wisdom. There can be no question of a Hebrew original for this addition (Hitz., LaG., Toy). It originated with some Greek who thought that the bee was at least as well suited as the ant to be an example of diligence and prudence; but to the Hebrew OT such a view of the bee, as BAUMG. rightly 40 points out, is quite foreign.
(II) After a somewhat arbitrary translation of this verse © adds:-

 But if thou art unwearied, thy harvest-wealth will come as a fountain, And want will desert thee like a bad runner.
These words are evidently an antithesis to V . II of $\mathrm{ml}_{\mathrm{I}}$, but in all probability were balanced against $\circledast$ in its present form. It is therefore useless, with LAG. and others, to labor over a supposed Hebrew original and its possible origin. The reference to harvest is derived from v. 8, and the comparison of it to a richly 50 streaming fountain may have been suggested by such passages as Amos 5,24 .
(25) (6 renders $25^{\text {b }}$ in a double form: first, by $\mu$ hne àpecuens бois üpeai $\mu$ ois which is the original translation; it presupposes בעמפפיך instead of $\mathfrak{A}$ בעמפם , but Prov.
 Hebrew original. Tov's judgment (p. 5I of his Commentary) is correct: - "This is not a scribal heterogram of the particular words of Al, but an independent, allegorizing reading of the schools. The next section also is taken as a description of moral folly and is introduced by the words ví́, $\mu \eta \dot{\kappa} \kappa . \tau, \lambda$."

 $\lambda \alpha \mu \beta \mathcal{D}^{2}$ translation must again be considered, with LaG. (against BAUMG.), to be a correction of the second and somewhat strange rendering. The variant údo evnau$\tau \omega \bar{\nu} \tau$. has probably arisen under the influence of 3,2 (so Toy), although $\mathbf{6}$ there

(21) In 6 we find two translations of this verse. One, rendering it xpporoi Éoovtal
 and (along with the other form), in Compl., Ald. This is regarded by LAG. and

 appears to show the hand of an Alexandrian reviser.
 $\alpha u ̉ \tau \eta ุ ๊ ~ o u ̉ \delta e ̀ v ~ \pi o v \eta \rho o ́ v ~(r e a d, ~ w i t h ~ J A ̈ G ., ~ G R A B E, ~ B A U M G ., ~ \pi o \theta \eta \tau o ́ v) ~ a n d ~ \epsilon u ̈ \gamma v w o \tau o ́ s ~$

 these two hemistichs, but in reversed order, represent the original translation, while $15^{\text {a.d }}$ is the work of a reviser.

 to $\mu 0 v$, as the utterance is from the mouth of God) and the other (vó $\mu o v$ dè kai
 31,26.
$\qquad$




 of үוขш்бкє!ร.
 and iva ool révwvial todגai $\delta \delta o i$ Biou. The latter departs much more from A but is no doubt more originat (Jäg., LaG., BaUMG.). The strange oboi does not point to a different reading (שנוח for Lag.) but is only a transcriptional error induced by dooús in v. II (so Toy).
(27) After this verse $\mathbf{6 3}$, but not $\mathfrak{S} \mathbb{C}$, add four lines:-




For God knows the ways of the right hand, But the ways of the left are crooked.
Thy paths He Himself will straighten
And lead forward thy ways in peace.
On p. 39 of his commentary Del. has the following very neat rendering into


## Nawarto

* The asterisk in $\mathscr{G}^{5^{*}} \&<$. denotes corrections by the original scribe.

After 24,22 and (6) differ also in the arrangement of the text: after the Collection of Aphorisms in 22,17-24,22 6 has the first half of the Sayings of Agur ben-lakeh (30, 1-14), preceded by five proverbs not found in $4 l$ (see below, p. 82, 1. 32); then follows the conclusion of c. 24, vis. vv. 23-34, containing the additional small collection of Aphorisms of the . Cages (3), and thereafter comes the second half of the Sityings of Agur ben-Jutieh (30,15-33), containing the Niumerical Prozerbs (see above, p. 67, 1. 32) and followed by the Sayings of Lemuel in 31,1-9.

In the final chapters $\mathbf{2 5 - 3 1}$ the arrangement is practically the same in both recensions except that, as stated above (11. 2.6), the . Sering's of Agur and L.emut 10 (30-31,9) precede in 6 cc. 25-29, the first section (30,1-14) being inserted between vv. 22 and .23 of c. 24, and the final section (30,15-31,9) after the last verse of c. 24: thus cc. 25-29 are inserted, in ©, between vv. 9 and 10 of c. 31 ; and the section 24,23-34 (aים b bas ) is interposed between Vv. I4 and 15 of c. 30. This arrangement of $6(22,17-24,22 ; 30,1-14 ; 24,23-34 ; 30,15-33 ; 31,1-9 ; 15$ 25-29; 31,10-31) is manifestly inferior to that of AI. - P. H.

I (7) Between $7^{a}$ and $7^{b}$ of alwo additional hemistichs are inserted in $\boldsymbol{\square}$ :-


The first of these is derived from $\psi \mathbf{I I O}$ ( $\boldsymbol{f l} \mathbf{I I I}$ ), 10 , where, also, it is preceded by á $\rho \times \dot{\eta}$ бopias qóßos Kupiou; the other is evidently a second translation of $7^{\text {a }}$ (so, too, Toy).

 It may be a substitute for some illegible passage in the Hebrew original (so LaG.) ; if. Crit. Notes on Isaiah, p. 80, 1.6; p. 86, 1. 15 ; p. 138, 1. 28 ; p. 152, 1. 3, ©ic.
(14) In $614^{\mathrm{b}}$ has a double translation:-


The first and freer rendering is to be regarded, with JÄG., LAG., and BaUMG., as the original ; the second is lacking in Cod. 23 of Holmes and Parsons.
 destruction) of the godless is evil, Heb. עודך אמשי רֶשע (DEL.). This brings to
 nothing but an explanatory gloss to the preceding өnбavoǐouøvv éauroîs kakd.
 the door of the mighty, which is evidently derived from 8,3 where mapù ràp 40


 sequently added and connected by means of $\Pi$ i. According to LAG., this fourth
 $\theta$ ópußos, which was moved down here because a parallel was required for $27^{\circ}$.

2 (2) 6 gives two translations of $2^{\text {b }}$ :-- каi $\pi \alpha \rho a \beta a \lambda \in i ̂ s ~ к u \rho \delta i a v ~ \sigma o v ~ є i s ~ v u ́ v e \sigma ı v ~ a n d ~ \pi a \rho \alpha-~$
 is, without doubt, a correction of the second and more original one, which pre- 50
 reading ax in $3^{\text {a }}$ which is attested by ©.


## Alppendix

 ¢
# zdditional Eines and ITemígtichs 

found in the

## Septuagintal Version of the Book


and

## Eines wanting in that @eraion.

HE SEPTUAGINTAL VERSION of the Book of Proverbs contains a number of and hemistichs not found in the received Hebrew text (cf. $1,7.14 .18 .21 .27 ; 2,2,19.21 ; 3,15.16 .22 .28 ; 4,10$. 27; 5.3.23; 6,8.11.25; 7,1; 8,21; 9,6.10.12.18; 10,4; 11,16; 12,11.13.26; 13,9.11.13.15; 14,22; 15, 1.18; 16, 1-3.5.17.26.30; 17,5.6.21; 18,22;19,7;22,8.9.14;24,22;25,10.20;26, $11 ; 27,20.21$; $28,10.17 ; 29,25)$. On the other hand, a number of hemistichs of Al are not represented in $\mathbf{6}\left(c f .7 ; 25 ; 8,29 ; 11,3^{b} \cdot 4 \cdot \mathrm{IO}^{\mathrm{a}} .1 \mathrm{I}^{\mathrm{b}} ; \mathbf{1 3}, 6\right.$; 15,$31 ; 16,1-3 ; 18,23-19,2 ; 20,14-19 ; 21,5,18 ; 23,23 ; 25,9$ ), and it is impossible to attribute all the clauses wanting in (6) to subsequent scribal to expansions of the Hebrew text. Some of the additional proverbs in $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$, however, may be mere variants or versional doublets (cf. $1,14.27 ; 2,2.19 .21 ; 3,15 ; 4,10$; 5,$23 ; 6,25 ; 9,6 ; 14,22 ; 15,1.18 ; 22,8.9 ; 28,17 ; 29,7.25$ ) or illustrative quotations ( $c f .1,7 ; 3,16.28 ; 9,12 ; 12,11 ; 13,13 ; 26,11)$ and explanatory glosses ( $c f$. 1,$18 ; 4,27 ; 13,15 ; 22,14$ ) or corrective interpolations (cf. 4,$27 ; 7,1$ and $\mathfrak{G}$ 's 15 omission of $11,3^{b} \cdot 4$; see also above, p. 62, 1.6) which afterwards crept from the margin into the text; others may have been found by the Greek translators, as subsequent expansions of Hebrew scribes, in their Egyptian recension of the Hebrew text (cf. 7, 1; 8,21; 9, 12.18; 10,4; 12, 11.13; 13, 13; 16, 1-3.17; 17,5.21; 19,7; 22, 11.14; 24,$22 ; 25,10.20 ; 27,20.21$ ); but we can 20 hardly suppose that all of the additional lines in 5 are based on a Hebrew original (cf. 4,$27 ; 5,3 ; 6,8,11 ; 14,23 ; 17,6$ ). The cases in which (5 seems to have preserved some משלים which formed part of the original Hebrew text of the Book of Proverbs ( $c f . \mathbf{1 I}, 16 ; 27,20.21$ ) are exceptional. Some of the additional proverbs of 6 are not given in 3. A Hebrew version of the additional 25 lines found in 6 is appended to Franz Delitzsch's commentary on Das salomonische Spruchbuch (Leipzig, 1873) pp. 543-547.
 gin the verse with an imperative, Beware.
 i. e. Textus Hebraici Emendationes quibus in Vetere Testamento Neerlandice vertendo usi sunt A. Kueninn, I. Hoovkaas, W. H. Kosters, H. OORT, cdidit H. Oort. Lugduni Batavorum, typis E. J. Brill, MCM]; but see König, Lehrgebüude, vol. 2, p. 245 , note 2.
(8) AI חhin; but perhaps the ๆ is due to dittography (the following verse begins with חnּp) and we must read, with Dys., Toy (all who suffer), "לח़.
(1i) For the alliteration in the first hemistich see above, note on $\mathbf{2 4}, \mathrm{I}$.
(15) According to Toy $\AA$ Is a gioss, a repetition or explanation of the second hemistich.
 prefer to read $y$ טִ, 3 , omitting which spoils the rhythm; explanatory addition just as and an in 25,21 or in F.ccl. 3.5.- P. H.]

(21) For the alliteration in this verse see note on 24,1 .

For ${ }^{\text {and }}$ we should, perhaps, read with LUTHER \&c., following drodds which, however, (5 takes with v. 22.
(25) Al Aimp perhaps better for the same reasons as in $30,25 \mathrm{ff}$. Cf. above, p. $68,1.26$.
(27) Kethîb תin is transcriptional error for



 $-m a$ in Arab. Allâhumma (see Crit. Notes on Numbers, p. 48, 1.45) cf. also Arab. halumma, Heb. 口hñ $^{2}$; see also Wright-de Goeje ${ }^{3}$ 2,343, 1. io.

In Ezek. 19,2, on the other hand, the מואמרח מוח seems to correspond to the Assyr. $m$ d 'thus, as follows,' introducing oratio directa (cf. Dex., Ass. Gr.
 begins with

The matter deserves further investigation.
The prefixed $\zeta$ in 3 ל ל is perhaps the emphatic particle ( $=$ Assyr. la-ikkal, cf. above, p. 52, 1. 11 and below, p. 86, 1. 28); otherwise we should have no apodosis.
(15) Cf. Cheyne, PSBA 23, 143. - P. H.]
(16) עצָּ (so, too, \$®) is struck out by Bickell. (5 ěpms ruvaikós probably read only ורחם.
7) For sa תnip ? (cf. Ges.-Kautzsch $\S 24$,e) we should perhaps read, with Frank., Tov, following (厅, ,

(20) Both the subject-matter and the prosaic form of this verse prove it to be a later addition [cf. above, p. 67, 1. 28]; so Dathe, Hitz., Del., Frankenberg.
(24) [Omission of in the second hemistich would improve the rhythm; it is probably a gloss on מחחקּמשים. OORT, Em. reads P. H.]
(25) Al in in impf. consec. (in the same way v. 26: might be explained as indicating facts known by experience; according to König, Synt. $\$ 369$, f the emphatic copulative connection may be used instead of other coördi- 25 nating conjunctions. But we should probably point $\begin{gathered}\text { \& } \\ \text { \& c, as simple modus }\end{gathered}$ rei repetita, just as we have the simple impf. in a negative clause in v. 30.
 แvv, שดตุด [so, too, OORT, Em.
(29) The first hemistich would gain by omitting החה. - P. H.]
(31) The text is hopeless; Dys. conjectures ingeniously זרויר מתנשא ותיש.



(33) The third clause of v. 33 may be the complement to a lost hemistich; but it is 35 probably nothing but scribal expansion added by some one who felt called upon to append a moral. [Cf. p. 65, 1. 29; p. 62, 1. 8. - P. H.]

 \$e is probably due to homcooteleuton of ברי. [The second however, is better omitted. Oort, Em. inserts רpk after at b. - P. H.]
(3) Instead of the curious $\overline{7}$ गָּרֶT of $\mathfrak{A l}$ we should perhaps read, with Dys., KAmph.,

For $\mathfrak{A}$ ninne Gesenius conjectured nimb (so also Del., Wild., Strack, Toy,


 mically superfluous and evidently only a dittogram of the words which follow, 50 with the addition of למואל.





 dently be read, with Dahi.er [contrast Crit. Notes on Isaiah, p. 196, 1. 11; note




 second hemistich: and I have learned the knowledge of the Holy One.


[For the brief hemistichs ושה שם בנו מה שמו see above, p. 34, 1. 13. - P. H.]解 (so, too, S区) is rhythmically superfluous and should be struck out, 15 with $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$, as a gloss from Job 38,5 .

(6) [The form :ppin (cf. Ges. Kautzsch ${ }^{26} \$ 528, \mathrm{~d} ; 75,4$ ) indicates the correct pronunciation of apocopated imperfect forms. Even forms like
 as dissyllabic forms, ie.hud \&c. They are all monosyllables and should be sounded as though they were written ${ }^{3 \times 1 \times 2}$ is merely an auxiliary vowel as in which does not differ in pronunciation
 ing $\mathbb{\aleph}$, while the final $n$ is simply a sonant nasal as in English listen, which is 2 not dissyllabic but practically ${ }^{\text {dind. Cf. Beitr. 8. Assyr. 1,294.328. }}$
(8) I believe that $8^{c}$ is a subsequent addition just as the final hemistich of the chapter, $33^{\mathrm{c}}$, and v. 20 ; but it seems to me that not only $8^{\mathrm{c}} .20$, and $33^{\mathrm{c}}$ but also $10.15^{\text {a }} \cdot 17.32$ are out of place and must be relegated to the margin. I do not mean to say that vr. 10.17.32 are glosses, they may be genuine and may have belonged to the collection, but they are not in their proper place in this section of numerical proverbs and should be inserted elsewhere. - P. H.]
(10) (10).
(13) II can hardly believe that represents an exclamative clause; ${ }^{\alpha}$ it is not taken as an exclamation in the Versions: $(\mathbb{G}$ (SWETE, p. 464) has ëкyovov (какöv)
 3 generatio cujus excelsi sunt oculi; © also has a relative clause, דוא דושו עונו, and the original reading of $\$$ may have been -asic ey! lis; the to we find before : in the Received Text may be a subsequent insertion; it is hardly probable that the conditional-temporal : (NöLD. ${ }^{2} \$ 258$ ) is a correction of the exclamative (NöLD. ${ }^{2}$ § $232, \mathrm{~A}, 3$ ). The $\boldsymbol{\pi} \mathrm{t}$ may be the enclitic emphatic -ma, which is so frequent in Assyrian and in Arabic. In a great many cases in Arabic where $L_{0}$ is said to be indefinite we have this emphatic particle, $c$. gr. in cases

 n. 3); see also Reckendorf, Die syntact. Verhaltnisse des Arabischem, Leyden 1895-98, pp. $165 \& 425$. The emphatic -ma appears in Hebrew in three forms:(1) as $\mathrm{KJ}^{-(c f . ~ a b o v e, ~ 1 . ~ 44) ; ~-~(2) ~ a s ~ i t ~ i n ~ i n g ~ \& c . ~(A s s y r . ~ k i-m a ~ \& c . ; ~ o f . ~ m y ~ A k k a d . ~}$ und Sumer. Keilschrifttexte, Leipzig, 188r, p. 195): - (3) המ.


[^2]28 (16) Toy omits $\mathfrak{A}$ גניד as a gloss. [This improves the rhythm, - P. H.]

 Grätz, Kamph., Wildeboer.


 Lag., Grätz, Bick., Kamph., Strack, Oort, Em., following \& and perhaps

(23) For ft which gives no meaning in this place and is rhythmically super- io fluous, read אֵֵñ, with BICk., at the end of the verse. This reading, it is true,
 The meaning afterwards, at last (STRACK in his Commentary: schliesslich) is uncertain; the reading of fl seems to be influenced by dogmatic considerations, to make God the speaker (therefore the accentuation 15
 Toy cancels as gloss or dittogram. [Oort, Em. reads אחרי קן.]
(24) $\mathfrak{A l}$ (so, too, (6se) is rhythmically superfluous and should be struck out, with Dys., BICK., as a scribal expansion.

29 (2) Al בl בnּדות צדיקים when the righteous rule, as suggested by Toy, would better suit the parallelism.
(6) For Al sense, read, with Pinsker (see Del. in loc.), עשִׁp in the step (cf. $1 \mathrm{~S} 20,3$ ), or, with Mandelkern (oral communication),
For $\mathfrak{A l}$ !
 the parallelism), which could only mean they seek his life (Ex. 4, 19; I S 20,3),
 fla [so, too, Oort, Em.; Cf., however, Crit. Notes on Ezekiel, p. 94, 1. 46.

(19) For עy to respond see above, p. 48, 1. 44. - P. H.]
 "ימון, with Bertheau, Strack. [Oort, Em. suggests,
(24) For of. Jud. 17,2; Lev. 5, I which must be translated: If a person, in spite of his having heard the adjuration of the judget, sin by not giving testimony when he is a witness, no matter whether he have seen the thing or only* heard of it, and thus incur guilt \&c. The apodosis to the four coördinated conditional clauses begins in v. 6, not in v. 5. Cf, the translation in Johns Hopkins University 40 Circulars, July '94, p. $114^{\text {a }}$ and contrast BÄNTSCH ad loc. - P. H.]


30 For the section 30-31,9 see Mühlau's dissertation quoted above, p. 32, 1. I. 45 [For c. 30 cf. Iepheti ben-Eli Karaita in Proverbionum Solomonis caput XXX Commentarius ed. Zacharias Auerbach, Bonnæ, 1866. See also E. J. Dillon, The Sceptics of the OT (London, 1895) pp. 133-156; 269-272.
(1) may mean hired slave; cf. Arab. 1 , Assyr. agru, agarru (Del., HW ${ }_{17} 7^{\mathrm{b}}$ ), or thinker, cf. Assyr. egirrut (Del., HW 18 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ ); the etymology is, of course, 50 very uncertain. - P. H.]
For $\mathfrak{A}$ 上 note on Num. 23,7] we must read, with Dys., either or or witu
 it that follows.

 Unless we are ready to adopt Bick.'s emendation we must omit ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ as an explanatory gloss to $\mathrm{yt}^{\prime}$ (cf. Neh. 10,29); otherwise the hemistich would be too long.




 Tר. The idea underlying the dual is the double life the weads. Cf. Sir. 2,12; Prov. 20, 10.23; Deut. 25,13 אבאן (AV, divers weights; see Ges.-
 (AV, with a double heart do they speaki) and our double dealing, double. 15 cyed, double-faced, double-handed, double-hearted, double--longued (Gierman dopperzuingig) \&c. The two ways do not refer to the good way and the bad way between which the man has to choose (Tor) but to the two parts the wacis, one secretly, and the other openly, the evil way which he pursues and the good way which he pretends to follow (so Fleischir in Delitzsch's Comm. and 20 Wildeboer). - P. H.]
 ever, may be a scribal expansion, suggested by Lev. 25,36; Ez. 18,8.13.17; 22, 12. - P. H.]
(10) The unnecessary third hemistich of $\mathfrak{A l}$ is found also in $\$ \mathbb{\$}$; it exists, too, in $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{( }$, but there, by the addition of another hemistich, it has been developed into an
 : hev: The hemistich is doubtless to be strucl: out as an antithetic scribal expansion. [Cf. p. 68, 1. 36 and Crit. Notes on Isaiah, p. 164, 1. 12.
(12) For fll
 mann (Hiob, Kiel '91): Kerkere ein ihren Trotz in der Cintervelt. In the cuneiform incantatory legend of the Descent of Istar ${ }^{\alpha}$ to Hades (Obv., 1. 38) the same expression is used: uppissi-ma ( $=$ huppiš + ši $^{\prime}$ off. Crit. Notes on Ezekiel,
 in our passage is due to partial assimilation of the original $\mathcal{y}$ to the following

 Notes on Isaiah, p. 84, 1. 45 and Notes on Ezekiel, p. 67, 1. 13; cf. ZA 4, 268. The form שפח? , may have been preferred in order to distinguish it from שin to be bound up, bandaged, dressed (Is. 1,6; Ez. 30.21). (6's rendering of $\mathfrak{A}$ wṇ वтא, údíqovtal ăvөpurtol is quite correct; údiokovtal, however, does not mean here they perish (A
 JÄger, that (f read bont: (cf. Umbremt's Commentary, Heidelberg, 1826. p. 381) 4

 תשs and $\$ L_{\rho} \Delta_{0}$, as we must read instead of the received lijado (ZAT 14, 211). - P. H.]
a [Cf. the reference in Slegrried-Stade's Lexicon, p. 184b, above.
${ }^{6}$ In SCHRADER's KB 6, I, P. 82 uppissi is translated treal her, but this rendering is marked as doubtful. - P. H.] Prov.

I would therefore propose, with due reserve, the following restoration of the


 easily have dropped out before ${ }^{\prime} י \boldsymbol{y}$, and it is curious that we have in $\left\{\begin{array}{l}\text {, instead }\end{array}\right.$ of two derivatives of ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ ' at the beginning of the second hemistich, two derivatives of at the beginning of the first hemistich.
(17) For fin we must read, with ©3, 7 , second hemistich,盉


(19) Instead of fl : D the parallelism would lead us to expect a noun governing ם解; Vogel, Bick., Frank., Toy, Oort, Em., following (6, צִ.


 but according to others,
 GRÄTZ טַעֶּ

 out, following $\mathbb{5} \$$. NeSTLE (Expository Times 8,6, p. 287) thinks that (probably to be read, with CHEVNE, תloni, in to be taken as a radical on account of $2 \mathrm{~S} \mathbf{1 7}, 19$ ) is a mistake for some form derived from צ with the meaning crucible, and that the same word lies behind (notice, before b), as in $\psi 12,7$ (cf. Wellhausen ad loc.). On the other hand, Cheyne (loc. cit. 8,7, pp. 335 f .) reminds us that בתוך הרפות is supported by $(\mathfrak{G}$, except that ( $\mathfrak{b}$ read ת בתוך חרפוֹ in the midst of insults and paraphrased its reading èv $\mu \epsilon \in \sigma \omega \quad \sigma u v \in \delta \rho i o u$ atuodzuv. The word $B y$, which belongs to the language of the Mishnah, Cheyne further holds, is only a variant of $\% n \partial b$, and this again is only an example of the explanatory additions which transcribers delight in.

(23) For $\mathfrak{A l}$,
 in Al as the first consonant of the following word.

 tures $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ before

(25) [For Al of the shaving of the hair, but cf. $\boldsymbol{q}^{\boldsymbol{c}}=\mathbf{v}$.
ד does not mean aftergrowth (TOv) but fresh verdure, shoots from the seed, comprising all plants in their incipient stage. In Gen, I, II denotes shoots 45 from the seeds both of yyy of $\gamma$, - P. H.]
 is a gloss on jambs, and overburdens the hemistich.
For $\mathfrak{f l}$ (so, too, (5®) GräTz most suitably conjectures pil on the analogy of 31,15 .
 $E m$.]; © has the singular in both hemistichs while $\mathbb{\$ \mathbb { E }}$ have the plural.

26 earthenware（0）（0），not to covering vessels of base metal with silver．－ P．H．］
Al arpen（so，too，9t）is usually，but artificially，explained as ferrent lips，i．e． overflowing with assurances of friendship；read，rather，with Bick．，arp？n，follow－




（28）A ATM；of．on this reading，to which witness is expressly borne by Qimhl and

聯；Toy（befools its possessor）．
 following（6）Exovola．\＆read תipuspe but ©

 renders quite differently：but a friend is suecter to a man thun fragrant woods
 1．10）．For Kamph．＇s rendering it would be better to read with Dys．for 20 ตรา．［OORT，Em．reads $\pi$ ต ר．－P．H．］
（10）ำำ，with the $Q^{e} r e ̂$ ；
解 ally foreign to it；read，with BICK．，$\pi \underset{\sim}{\text { sin }}$ and omit $ל \mathbb{8}$ ，which is better both in rhythm and meaning．
（12）For fil ne should perhaps read，with Toy，
（13）For $\mathfrak{A l}$（ A ，too，$\$$ ），which could only refer to a harlot（ $c f .5,20 ; 6,24$, \＆．c．）， read，with Revss，STRACK，נָ，following（ 5 ₹ $\alpha$ à ùn入ótpla，（which Vogel，regards， but probably wrongly，as a translation of $\boldsymbol{\pi}$（כコ），and $20,16 \mathrm{~K}^{\mathrm{e}}$ thîb．
 sions．－P．H．］
（15）For Ai A ，which could be nothing but Nif．of with abnormal transposition
 Bick．，Toy．［For ©f．note 107 of the paper cited above，p．33，1．43．－P．H．］


 predicate after a preceding feminine subject is impossible．
［Toy calls all the readings that have been suggested for this line，desperate ex－ pectients．（6＇s rendering is intelligible but incorrect．It is possible that the author 40 of this meant to allude to the fact that the North（more accurately North－ west）wind is indeed cold and rough in winter（cf． 25,23 ），but pleasant and refreshing during the summer months，while the South（or more accurately the Southeast）wind is called fareorable（ the summer months，just as unbearable as the sirocen（cf．BENZANGER＇s Het． 45 Arih．，p． 30 and ilid．，p．31，4，also B．FDEKER＇s Palestina ${ }^{5}$ ，p．xlvii，and Luke 12， 55 ：


In view of the numerous etymologies in J we can safely believe that the author
 doubt the fact that ${ }^{\prime}$ ：meant fazorable，propitious in Hebrew（if．juan Gen． 50 35,18 ）just as in Arabic．Assyr．limmu＇evil＇is probably a compound of lî－imnu （cf．above，p．51，1．10）＇not right，inauspicious＇（see Beitr．8．Assyr．1，467）； cf．Assyr，lá banitu＇sin，＇Zimmern，Busspsalmen，p．37，n． 2.

26 (2) [In the cuneiform incantations we find: May the disease of the head (Assyr. muruç qaqqadi, that is, perhaps, erysipelas, St. Anthony's fire; see ZA 8, 182) fly awvay like a bird (Assyr. kîma iç̧ari littapras"; Del., HW 545b); cf. also Zimmern, Busspsalmen, p. Ior ; Del., HW $650^{\circ}$ s. v. עחש. - P. H.] K K Kethîb with (6sec; Q'rê h; of. above, p. 52, 1. 5.
(5) [V. 5 may be a corrective interpolation; of. my note on the corrective interpolations in Eccl. (Johns Hopkins University Circulars, June 1891, p. 115, n. S) and above, p. 45, 1. 42; also p. 58, 1. 6; p. 65, 1. 28. Possibly v. 8, which interrupts the connection between vv .7 and 9 , should be inserted after v. 4. - P. H.]


(7) $\mathfrak{M}$ is grammatically impossible and probably to be emended, with Dys., to 放 they hang down since

(8) Instead of $\mathfrak{A l}$ (so, too, © and Bick.; \$ ${ }_{\wedge}$ ) read, with Dys., Grätz, Toy, 15 า
(10) עy (y) which is unintelligible at the end of the verse, is to be put, with Bick. and Oort, Em., after ל.


(17) For fl ing tail instead of ears is perhaps preferable: if you take a snappish cur by the ears he will hardly be able to bite, but if you take hold of his tail the case is different. - P. H.]
 besides being rhythmically superfluous, or to be attached to the first hemistich, as is done by Del., Now., Dys., Bick., Kamph, Wild. [It would seem to be more natural to read, with $\mathfrak{I}$ commiscetur vixce alterius and $\$$ at!
 Delitzsch's Commentary, p. 427, below). For $\$$ \$ $\$$ we must substitute, with 30
 other man. In the Arabic Version, ed. Lag., كهi si
 does not mean here حكومة but حتخانتّ; cf. Herod. 5,5. The transposition of the two consonants in $\mathfrak{m}$ מתעבר was, of course, influenced by the preceding עבר 35 at the end of the first hemistich. ${ }^{\alpha}$ We have here an intentional paronomasia, of. I. M. Casanowicz, Paronomasia (Boston, 1894), p. 68, No. 291. The preposition y does not militate against the correctness of the reading טתערב. In the first place, we may read $3 k=\zeta 20,19$; furthermore, 2 may have the meaning in addition to (Ges.-BuHL³3 $609^{\text {b }}$, r); of. לy y
 which, changed into ומות, has found its way to the end of the verse. The removal of ומות compels us to add , before all ary.
 but the parallelism is in favor of the Received Text.
(23) [סטיג makes the first hemistich too long and should be omitted (cf. above, p. 44,

 tions is the smooth superficial covering. As זרש is always crockery in distinction from vessels of metal (cf. Lev. 6,21), why must refer to the process of glazing 50

[^3]find 0 ；ow in the same meaning，it would seem that all these various forms are subsequent modifications of $17+2$ ．Lagarde＇s theory that is shortened from قدم represents a partial assimilation to the）（see Beitr．z．Assyr．1，264 below）and the $b$ in be a subsequent assimilation of the $>$ to the initial 3 （cf．above，p．42， 1．29）．ה is a word like present which is originally identical with $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ 苟 shecp； see Crit．Notes on Isaiah，p．204，1． 6.
 to smash，＇Del．，HW $475^{\mathrm{a}}$ ．－P．H．］
（19）Instead of Al ， ling tooth as it is commonly explained，deriving from רצע ，read，with OORT （see below，1．18；cf．Lim．），
 Haggadistic interpretation see indicated in the Introduction to Eliha rabbuthi （p． 13 of WÜnsche＇s translation），and cf．M．T．Houtsma in ZAT＇95，pp． 150 f． 15解 to $\mathrm{v} .19^{\mathrm{b}}$ ．We must strike it out，with Lagarbe（he regarded it as $=$ ¢ and originally a gloss on $\gamma$ 昆 in $\mathrm{v}, 18^{\mathrm{a}}$ ）and with OORT（Feestbündel ．．．aian Dr．P．J．Veth，pp．21 f．）．Yet this strangely shortens the second hemistich．
 and lag．，Bick．，Oort，Wildeboer．
Instead of $\mathfrak{A l}$ נָזָ（so，too， $\mathbb{e}$ ；also in $\mathfrak{Z}$ liAN is to be read for lid，see Pink．）
 pov from Ékos sore，ulcer；hence Grätz，OORT（see above，1．18），phs Lev． 25

 Luke 10，34．）The emendation pep seems to be correct（contrast Toy ad loc．）． （6）has in Lev．13，30－37；14，54 $\theta \rho \alpha 0 \sigma \mu \alpha$ ，for which it would be better to read
 tinea tonsurans and tinea sycosis．－P．H．］
 glosses．［Cf．below，note on 31， 16 ．
（22）התח can hardly denote heap or snatch up and put upon（TOY），but it may mean
 ＇to kindle，to light，＇oqhit＇t ：maritot＇lamp，candlestick，torch＇（see Jolns Hop． kins Universily Circulars，March，1884，p． $51^{\text {a }}$ and Ges．，Thes．，s．v． 1 nm）．Nor is this meaning unsuitable in 6，27 and Is．30，14．In $\psi 52,7$ rnmst be derivo ed from חתn（cf．Wellhausen，Skizzen und Vorarbeiten，part 6，p．175；so， too，GräTZ，Comm．）．Jerome in his Psalterium juxta Hebracos renders terrehit 40 or wather forrebit（cf．Nestlie，Psalterium Telraglothum，Tüb．，1879）；A，$\pi$ ton＇－
 （Dalman＇s Wörterbuch s．v．）．Assyr，xath，which Brown－Driver－Briggs＇ Lexicon compares，has no connection with this stem，but corresponds to Arab．
 murci DEL．，HW $295^{\text {b }}$ below＇，ixati NE 51，9，tartí＇overthrow．＇－I＇．H．］

 DEL．，DYS．，BICK．，following Ex．18，18；yet both the masculine plur．and the parallelism make this reading somewhat dubious．Frank．，following（o）（see 50
 praise）sparvingly（cf．v．17；Is．13，12）．［רוק＝Assyr．usaigir，see Zcitschrijt fiur Keilschriffforschung，vol．2，p． 269 DEL．，HW $240^{\text {a }}$ ．－P．H．］
 Bickell, Frank, with v. 8a, where we should have then to read, with Bick.,

(8) $\mathfrak{m}$; Frank., Toy, צי (for how wilt thou fare in the end \&c.), but the following clause, שמה תעשה אחריתח, is the first hemistich of a second line, and the second hemistich of the first line, except $[p$, is lost.
(ii) For Al stïcken [sic!], which is supposed to mean like golden gravings on carved figures of silver; Toy: Like graved work of gold and carved work of silver (scil. just as indelible). But what are goldene Graviuren or golden gravings? And are those io engraved on stones more easily effaced?
[LuTHER's rendering Güldene Äpfel in silbernen Schalen (AV, apples of gold in pictures of silver) cannot be justified, but is certainly better than the translations suggested by modern commentators. I believe that an is a cor-
 Jud. 9,48. There may have been even a collective noun משוֹה Gezweig so that we might read במשוֹכח כסף. Also © $\$$ appears to mean branch, rod; the Pael 7נב to whip may be denominative. (P. S. - I have since noticed that Hitz.


It is not impossible that the unintelligible על-אָמָּ of $\mathfrak{A l}$, at the end of the line, 20
 (עבּן עֲפאים יתנו קול); Dan, 4,9.11.18. At any rate this conjecture is better than
 = Prov. 15,23; so Abulwalíd) or with בעתוֹ in his way, so Ibn Ezra); cf. Delitzsch's Commentary, p. 404, 1. 4 and Ges.-Buhl³ s. v.

However that may be, so much seems to me certain that we have here a mythological reminiscence, just as in the case of עקור חיים (cf. above, p. $36,1.30$ ), viz. an allusion to the Semitic prototype of the golden fruit of the Hesperides; cf. the ${ }^{\text {a }}{ }^{2}$ in Ezek, 28, 12 ff. (see Toy's notes in our new English translation of Ezekiel, p. 155, 1.9) and the description of the garden of the gods 30 in the Babylonian Nimrod Epic (ed. Haupt, p. 63, 11. 48-51), where the trees of the gods (iç̧e ša ilanni) bear pearls (saindu; see my article Wo lag das Paradies? in Uber Land und Meer, 1894/95, No. 15) as fruit (inbu), the branches (xunnatu) hanging full of them, pleasant to the sight (ana dagdli tabat; Gen. 3,6 תוגֶּ הוּ
 on Daniel, p. 24, 1. 42), while the foliage (xaf̧xaltu =xaçxaçtu; of. خوص, Syr.
 of lapis lazuli (uknt; see Johns Hopkins University Circulars, July '94, p. III); the fruit it bore was beautiful to behold (ana amari $\xi^{\prime} d x ;$ cf. DeL., HW $566^{a}$. $284^{\text {a.b }}$; see also SCHRADER's KB 6, 1, p. 208, 11. 47-51. I would therefore restore 40
 Like apples of gold on branches of silver is a word spoken in due season.

It is a legendary reminiscence just as we speak of the Golden Age, the Philosopher's stone, the Holy Grail, \&c. Contrast ZAT 21,80. - P. H.]
 ( $=$ = תוכחת? GräTz); Bick. דָּוּ
 a superfluous element in the verse, and is probably only an addition to the comparison completely expressed in the preceding two clauses.

 and $ワ$ (cf.e. g. Lev. 25,26 ). Syr. ©.0 means both enough and already, just as


24 (17) Instead of the Kethib follow ©S® and read the Qerê required also by בנֵּשלו.
 be not overbearing with either of them. But would not this admonition be rather superfluous?

 perhaps, simpler to read, with Dys., ,
(26) [ $\mathfrak{M}$ makes the second hemistich too long and may be scribal expansion, of. above, p. 55, 1. 23. - P. H.]
(27) Since the first two clauses form a complete iine we must recognize the existence of

Al וֹנבי must be explained as perf. consec. after a disconnected adverb of time: afterwards, then thou mayest $\& \mathrm{cc}$. Cf. the illustrations given in Ges.KAUtzsCH § $112,00$.
(28) [For an minn D. H. Müller, l. c. prefers ann, following Ex. 23,1; Deut. 19, 16; $\psi \psi 27,12 ; 35,11 .-$ P. H.]
For $\mathfrak{M}$ กุ only as II'el of with the prefixed interrogative a, but for an interrogative particle after : there would hardly be any analogy, except perhaps in אואוֹה $2 \mathrm{~S}_{15,35 \text {. A question, however, is out of place here, if only on account of the }}$ preceding prohibitive clause.
(29) [The last clause of the verse, Al seems to be an explanatory
 ל the second hemistich. - P. H.] ",
(31) ?קִשְׁנִים with the majority of MSS (including Cod. Erfurt. 3, Jaman., and Petropol. a. 1oio) as well as in accordance with the statement of SAMSON HANNAQDAN 30 (about 1240 A. D.) and according to the editio princeps (Naples, 1486), Compl.,
 aside as of no use, تُتْ to eat what one may chance to find, even if it be
 must be rejected. [Cf. Crit. Notes on Isaiah, p. 16\%, 1. 24.



 ne its hedge of thorns zuas remozed. In this way he arranges the 40 five verses $(30-34)$ in two stanzas, each consisting of three lines or six hemistichs. - P. H.]

 with ©st ; [cf., however, above, p. 34, 1. 31. - P. H.]

 .
Verse 5, whose structure is exactly the same, shows that we must read kyy for ㅆㅗㅃํ․․
 ina libbi tamdi (SĊhrader's KB r, p. 166, l. 59; Delitzsch, HW 698a). As a


(35) For the brevity of the hemistich טתי see above, note on 1,10 . The entire verse is probably a gloss of an 'antiteetotaler,' who admits that intoxicating liquors may be poison, but a very palatable and comparatively harmless poison from which he does not propose to abstain in the future. The two verbs הפוני and represent conditional clauses: If they have struck me or They may have struck me. טמי is here conjunction, = own, , mi.

##  וברוֹונה יתפונו <br> 

 and in v . 3 :-24 (I) Note the alliteration in v. 1:In the 2 stanza, however, there is no trace of it; nor is the alphabetical device
 and in v. II of the last chapter: -
 In all these cases, however, this alliteration may be accidental; $c f$. above, p. 54 , 1. 31. - P. H.]
 following 3i, 17. But evidently Kamph., Wild., Toy, following ©st, and also in $5^{\text {b }}$ (cf. Job 9,4). Such comparisons are very common in the style of the Book of Proverbs (also in Ecclesiasticus): not only persons are compared with each other (cf. 16,32; 19, 1; 27,10; 28,6) but also conditions and actions (15, 16f.; 16, 8. 19; 17, 1; 21,9.19; 2 $25,7.24$ ). Further, we have perhaps to add, with Bick., Toy, חוב after The suggestion of Grätz that נבר may be a corruption of נבְחָ (see above, p. 41, 1. 40) breaks down on the alphabetical arrangement; [cf., however, above, 1. 14.]
(6) בill בi; Dys., following (6, בלְ by the counselor's insight.

 MüLlier, l.c., makes the first hemistich, and inserts a second התרפית ביום צרום ציום before ${ }^{\text {man }}$. He combines this line with the following two verses, and translates the passage as follows:- If thou hast been slack in the time of trouble of others, thy strength may fail on the day of thy own trouble. Therefore deliver those 35 $\& c$. If we adopt this explanation, it would be better to read, at the beginning of the second hemistich, ביום צר לך; but the proposed restoration is hardly satisfactory. - P. H.]

 mutation of Qâmeç to Seghôl under the influence of the following $\bar{T}$ (cf.
 be supported only by the doubtful analogy of רודחה (Gen. 46,3); of ירע we have, in addition to however, seems to be intended not as an infinitive but as an emphatic impera- 45 tive like ללנָה, \&c. - P. H.]
The last two hemistichs of this verse, although $\Omega t$ is supported by $\llbracket వ \mathbb{Z}$, are struck out by Bick. as borrowings from 25,16 and 23, 18 .
 Toy.

a [y may alliterate with \&; cf. Casanowicz, Paronomasia (Boston, 1894), p. 28.]

 aỉ, 兀ívi øev̂; J. D. Michaelis (Gütt. 1778) translated (Velkeil; Ziegler (Lpz. 1791) Ekel, comparing (uhid') 'nausea;' König, Leehrgel, ii, 1,339, derives אבוי from was translated paupertas, miseria and considered to be an abstract form to stitute אֲהָה for $\mathfrak{A l l}$.
 Busspsalmen, p. 116, below; Assyr. W ärtertuch, p. 218; Handzuërterbuch, p. 32³; Assyr. Gr. $\S 54$; Zimmern, Beitr. sur bublyl. Religion, I (1.pz. '9()), p. 23 below; 10 of. Crit. Notes on Ezekiel, p. 87, 1. 39. For the Assyr. $\hat{a}=$ Heb. 6 see ZA 2,26r, n. 3; contrast Delitzscr, Assyr. Wörterb., p. 215, n.4. The Ancient

 be used in the sense of $\alpha \sigma \in \beta \in I \alpha$ ). - P. H.]
 p. 50, 1. 29.
(31) The K $K^{c}$ chifl (purse) is a manifest transcriptional error for the $Q^{c} r$ rê

(34) An mut the meaning is uncertain, and the whote phrase is peculiar. Nor is 20

 in both hemistichs. Perhaps we should substitute at at the end of the verse, for the first בשׁב, and read on thou veilt be like a sailor in the midst of the sea, like a person suffering from seasickness on the high seas. The 25
 not mean helmsman, nor is it necessary to restrict its use to professional sailors: any passenger on a ship may be called $\mathrm{han}_{\text {; }}$ just as we speak of a passenger who does not suffer from seasickness as being a good sailor. Cf. also Sindbad the Sailor, \&ic. For the etymology of hote. hat in weatorst; cf. Zeph. 2, 5. 30

Thus the first hemistich refers to the nauseating effect of intemperance, the squeamishness of the stomach: excessive drinking turns the stomach of the wine-bibber; of. Job 20, 14: לחמו בטעעי נהסך טלות פחנים בקרבו (and the gloss ibid, v. 16). The second hemistich probably describes the last stage, the stupor caused by an overdose of intoxicating liquors; שאו must be the 3 word for poison (cf. $32^{2}$ אחריתו כנחש יעשך and Deut. 32,33), and the last word of the verse, which was displaced by לan, was perhaps nרוn; cf. Matth. 27,34
 therefore restore this line as follows: -

> And thou wilt be like a seafaring man in the midst of the sea And like one fallen asleep after a draught of poisonous gall.

literally like one slecping through the poison of gall. The rendering Or as he that lieth upon the top of a mast (so AV) is impossible: a man cannot lie or sleep upon the highest point of a mast. Nor is Tov's rendering much better: Thou will be like one who is sleeping at sea, like one asleep in a violent storm (cf. above, 1. 22; ( 5 Ev modio kגúduvi). Slecfing at seed is a ferfectly normal condition, and even in a violent storm to be asleep is certainly more comfortable than to be awake. Besides, we must remember Math. 8,24.
P. S. - Budde (viii/2 'oo) sugge-ts 2 בצ' for in the first hemistich. If 50 we adopt this reading, לỵn> could be explained as a misplaced gloss on 23 . (cf. below p. (o, 1. 21), or At might be connected with : Irabic thic inhich is used of deadly poison, (سّ" قاتل); if. Assyr. satiihlu 'pernicious' (H1i' 267n). Rakâbu

23 (4.5) The first hemistich of v. 4 is combined by D. H. MÜLLER with the three hemistichs of V .5 in the following manner: -

Toil not to make thyself rich, for riches makes itself wings,
Like an eagle it flies heavenward, if thou makest thine eyes fly after it, it is gone. The $\pi$ before $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ חע would have to be omitted. D. H. MÜller's line can only mean Lässest du deinen Blick darauf hinfiegen ? - Fort ist es (see Delitzsch's Comm., p. 366), but never Lässest du deinen Blick darauf hinfliegen, without $\beta$, as a conditional clause. $\frac{\pi}{c}$ cannot be used as a conditional particle. - P. H.]
(5) Al iaxin-ףinn (so, too, (68®) is an unnecessary third clause; Bick. gets from
 For ๔ תיצו. [Paul Ruben, Crit. Remarks on Some Passages of OT (London, 1896),

 if thou lookest at it with pleasure. For $\Pi=$ if see above, 1. го. -P . H.]
Instead of 門 (so, too, (6) subject is absolutely essential.

 Of the second hemistich of this line only has survived.
(8) $\mathrm{Onv} .3^{\mathrm{b}}$ as continuation of $\mathrm{v} .8^{\mathrm{a}}$ see above in the note on v. 3; v. $8^{\mathrm{b}}$, although its present position in $\mathfrak{A}$ is supported by $\mathfrak{G I C}$, must be placed, with Bick., after v. 9. [It seems to be a gloss to $8^{\text {b }}$. - P. H.]
(10) Instead of $A l$ (so, too, (5s®) read Toy, and the parallelism.

 тnprions autd; following this, read either, with Bick.,

 Crit. Notes on Judges, p. 66, 1. 1) and is therefore always plural ( $=$ ( $)$ ), never singular ( $=1$ b). The passages where 15 seems to stand for ib (Ges.-Kautzsch $\$$ Io3, $f$, note 3 ) must be corrected accordingly. In Is. 44,15 Cheyne reads is 3


 .
(22) In $22^{\text {b }}$ we have an antiprolepsis; cf. Crit. Notes on Ezra, p. 71, 1. 31. - P. H.]

In the second hemistich read, with the $Q^{e} r e \hat{e}$, $K^{e}$ thîb וישמח equivalent to a conditional clause (cf. above, on 17,21) with following Waw apodosis; cf. Ges.-Kautzsch, § 143, d.
(25) V. 25 stands before v. 24 as apodosis to v. 23. It is strange that the mother should be mentioned twice; TOY is probably right in omitting at the end of the first hemistich. [Tani may be a misplaced gloss (cf. above, p. 45, 1. 35), with Wawe explicativum (cf. Crit. Notes on Ezra-Nehemiah, p. 68, 1. 53; Crit. Notes on Ezekiel, p. 116, 1. 2), on יולחT at the end of the second hemistich. - P. H.] 50

(27) For All (so, too, s®) we should probably read, with GRäTZ, following ( $\mathfrak{G}$,

 has ${ }^{1}$ בּ
fll
 this a doublet the second form of which apparently omits a'מ.
Instead of the strange fill לִy (so, too, ©) read, with Dys., KAMPH., nyַy, follow-
 of v .18 (so to be read for $\nrightarrow$ I


 read דיום: with Bick., Cheyne, STrack. AV, I have made known to thee this day, czen to thee, but there is no reason for emphasizing the pronominal suffix (Ges.-Kautzsch § 135, e) in this case; contrast DelitzsCh ad loc.
 the current interpretation of this as choice troops, then, taken metaphorically for choice speeches, has absolutely no foundation; (5\$d express three-fold or for the third time.
(21) Al Instead of $\mathfrak{m}$ 可


fit אמרי אמת , in the first hemistich, and fin second, may be scribal
 אที่ Dan. 2,14. - P. H.]
 Frank., בpy and (and He will cheat those who cheated them of their life).

(27) 解 is unnecessary for the meaning and for the rhythm, and should be struck out, with BiCK., following $\mathbf{5} \mathbb{\mathbb { E }}$; its origin was probably through dittography of ab in (Bick.). [In Eccl. 5, 5 the case is different. - P. H.]
Instead of at mp? read, with ( $5 \mathbb{A} \mathbb{C}$, anp?: [see, however, Crit. Notes on Isaiah, p. 121, 1. 9 and above, p. 52, 1. 44 .
(29) For the etymology of (cf. above, p. 33, 1. 24) see note 48 of the paper quoted above, p. 33, 1. 43.
The second clause, fll לפני טלכים יתיצב is a superfluous explanatory gloss. P. H.]

23 (3) BICK. is justified in striking out this verse, though $\sqrt[6]{2} \mathbb{C}$ agree with $\tan$ in supporting it; $3^{a}$ is a doublet to $6^{b}, 3^{b}$ belongs to $8^{a}$, while $8^{b}$ is a gloss to $9^{b}$ (see below, p. 56, 1. 25).
 in his Terthritische Glossen zu den l'merthien, cc. 23.24 (vol. 14 of the Vienna Oriental Journal, p. 150) inserts $4^{b}$ between $9^{a}$ and $9^{b}$, and adds $8^{b}$ as fourth
 [standing Speak not to a fool, desist from rimparting to him thy underFor he will despise thy wise werds, and thou will hare riasted thy grood adrice. 50 But חרל טבינתך cannot mean Deine Einsicht enthalte ihm vor. Withhold thy
 3,27; 23, 13; 30,7.

21 neither schrwiegerelterliches Haus (Delitzsch, Assyr. Wörterb., p. 151, 1. 15) nor Haus der Verwandtschaft (Del., HW 82a); ematu means union and corresponds to עמשית. It is not impossible that which we find exclusively in Levit. and in Zech. 13,7, is a Babylonian loan-word. Perhaps we should read in all passages yמוח instead of תy co. below, p. 57, 1. 18 and contrast Crit. Notes on Ezra-Neh., p. 66, 1. 53. As to גבר עמיח Zech. 13,7, translated by Wellhausen, Kl. Proph.3, p. 49: mein Vertrauter, cf. ibid. p. 195 (intimus), 3 vir coharens miki, שילמונג חבריה דכוְתה דדם ליה , it might be well to add that Assyr. ema means not only to be united, but also to be like; see Zimmern, Busspsalmen, p. 69. (For NE 8r, 46 cf. now KB 6, 1, p. 155.) - P. H.]
(iI) $\mathfrak{A l}$ a graphy) after the $ל$ in inich immediately precedes (Pinkuss).
(19) (2) of. note on v. 9.
(20) (in from v. 17 and is to be struck out as rhythmically overloading the verse.
 repetition by mistake from $2 I^{2}$.
(26) Instead of $\mathfrak{A}$ (so, too, S区) there must of necessity have been a subject

 [perhaps dittography of preceding התאו. - P. H.], the original reading רע (or (פָּun? GräTz) has plainly survived. [OORT, Em. suggests - P. H.]
(27) For all (so, too, S
(28) and a man who hears will speak for ever is absolutely





(4) [The recurrence of the initial $y$ in vv. 2-4 (cf. 11,9-12; 20,7-9.24-26) is accidental (cf. p. 53, 1. 6); these verses form no groups (Driver, Introd. ${ }^{6}$, p. 395, n. $\dagger$ ); cf. below, p. 58, 1. 18. - P. H.]
(5) Al A Mo, too, $\mathfrak{A s}$; $\mathbb{C}$ ( passes over one of the two words, probably according to PINK.) is suspicious in that פחתים follows without a conjunction. Its mean- 35 ing also is a question; elsewhere the word means thorns, and nisy means fishhooks. Dys.'s conjecture of צִפוּים hidden (so, too, GräTz) deserves consideration. Frank. and Toy prefer to read yoy following Job $\mathbf{1 8}$, 9 , where stands in parallelism with $\pi \triangleright$, but the text there is very doubtful.
(8) Al בְלְ!; so all texts, but unintelligible.

 by both rhythm and sense. [Oort, Em. suggests ins. - P. H]


In Al the remains of a second line of two hemistichs have been joined into one hemistich which, it is true, will bear explanation as antithesis to v . $\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{a}}$ (JHVH can be gained through a pure heart; the king, through graceful words). The fact is, however, that only $\Pi$ has survived of the original third hemistich
 ge), we must read, with Bick.,


(21) The K ${ }^{\text {cthîb }}$ b is evidently a transcriptional error; the Qérê is also

 and Bertheau, עי as a substantive, y? We must read, as in $\mathbf{1 2 , 1 3}$ (see above, p. 45, l. 40), (נ) (cf. 6,2) instead of $\mathfrak{A l}$ 世 clause, ילעי (point ybl: of. below, p. 67, I. 20) is shortened impf. Qal (cf. above,

 not refer to Lev. 27,33 ; in our passage the verl) means simply to consider. The idea is, a man should not make a rash, inconsiderate vow but should consider the matter before he binds himself. (6's rendering of this line, maris avopi $\tau a x u$
 it does not presuppose a different text. The primary meaning of $\mu \in \tau \alpha v o$ eiv is not repentance but reconsideration, afterthought. - P. H.]
(26) At A! in impf. consec. joined to a participle expressing a repeated action (cf. Ges.-Kautzsch $\S 111, \mathrm{u}$. It is questionable, however, whether the text is not

For אומן Grätz and Chajes (p. 3) prefer athe shall bring upon them their own iniquity); of. 2 S $16,8 \mathrm{al}$. and exactly the same phrase in $\psi 94,23$.
[For the recurrence of the initial $b$ in vv. $2 t-25$ of. p. 54, 1. 31. - P. H.]

(28) [For nמא ו in see above, p. 47, 1. 43; for an in the second hemistich we should probably substitute following (5) evv סıкaıoouvñ. - P. H.]
(30) (the with the $\mathrm{K}^{c}$ thibb, although a Hif. from is not found elsewhere; for the 25

Qerê ping cig. Est. 2, 3.9.12.
2 I (4) $\mathfrak{A l}$ Is evidently $\mathfrak{M}$ צreaking up of follow ground (Lat. novale) and is thus of


 Fränkel, Aram. Fremdzo., pp. 94.131), but in these languages means yoke,
 is properly subactio agri. The stem of Ass. niru 'yoke, collar' is ,ك. - P. 11.]
(6) $\mathfrak{A l}$ ?

Instead of the meaningless (so, too, g®) read 'שprow, with Cappellus, Wild., Oort, Em., following ש; Hitz., Ew., Dys., Toy, 'שׁpbỵ.
(8) [ rl is supposed to be an intransitive adjective (derived from jg uasira, impf.
 Th1 Gen. 11,30 (so König ii, 1, 556, n. 1); but it is impossible that the initial 1 should have been preserved in this case: 711 is probably nothing but a corrupt dittogram of the following 71 (so STADE, TLZ '94, col. 234). As in a great many cases, the dittogram has displaced the original word qualifying erx, of. e. g. V. 26 and Crit. Notes on Isaiah, p. 169, 1. 21. In ולז Gen. 11,30 the 1 for is simply due to an accidental error; so, too, in the Oriental at the end of 45 2S 6,23; cf. Driver ad loc. See also Crit. Notes on Numbers, p. 49, 1. 11. - P. H.]
 (ובית חבר (f. 25,24), but the Received Text would seem to be correct; בית חבו however, probably does not mean house in common (RVM) but conjugal chamber, although the Assyr. hit chirri, quoted in my Akkudische Sprache (Berlin, 1883) p. xxxiv was based on the incorrect publication of the cuneiform text in iv $\mathrm{R}^{\mathrm{t}} 27,11^{\mathrm{b}}$. The new edition in iv $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ shows that we must read, not bit ebûri, but bit emûti as in iv R $1,40^{\text {a }}$ (cf. Nimr. Ep. 81, 46.48). B'it emâti means

I9 (7) The first two hemistichs of v. 7 form one line independent and complete in itself; the third clause belongs to a second line, the first hemistich of which is lacking in At [cf. Driver's Introd. ${ }^{6}$, p. 395, below]. © has two additional hemistichs before this second line, but without connection with the v .7 of $\mathfrak{A l}$.
*ל with the Kethib; Q ${ }^{\ominus}$ rê th to him they belong; cf. 26,2; Ezra 4,2; $\psi 100,3$.
(8) According to Als punctuation would be casus pendens and equivalent to a conditional clause (cf. above, note on 17,21 ) and $\boldsymbol{x}$ ) would have to be understood as dependent on some verbal idea like it happens (cf. Ges.-Kautzsch § 114, h.i). But for $\mathfrak{m}$ Kצ? , we should perhaps read nyp?: with Dys., Toy, following $(\mathfrak{G}$ єúpク́ण $\sigma \mathrm{t}$ and $\mathbb{C}(6 f .16,20 ; 17,20)$. [It is not impossible that we have in this K a trace of the prefixed emphatic ל (cf. above p. 48, 1. 15): Nצמ' + ل verily

 imperative (so MARTI, alt.) with prefixed emphatic ל. To add הצִ, with Cheyne, or מום (MARTI) would mar the rhythm. - P. H.]
(iI) Instead of $\boldsymbol{A}$ (for which we should expect at least the impf. as the modus rei repetita, Ges.-Kautzsch $\int$ io7, e) read with Grätz, Pink., Wild., following \$ and corresponding to the parallel
(16) As almost all the antithetic hemistichs standing second are joined on with i,
 1 and $I$ were transposed, or 9 fell out after the preceding ) (haplography).
Frank.'s and Toy's suggestion to read, following 13, 13 , דוכיו ( 1 , 1 , dittogram from following 1 ) deserves consideration.
תit: with the $Q^{\text {erê }}$ (so © and Bick., perhaps also (6. amodeîtat, of. Job 4, 21);

(19) Instead of (Kathib) which is an evident transcriptional error, read, with the Qerê, 4균. Yet it is certainly a question whether the original reading was not something absolutely different; cf. Hitzig.
(20) M באחריתך; it is perhaps better to read, with Frank., following Syr. Sir, 2,3,


(28) AI A13:; better perhaps $y$ ' 1 ', with Frank., following $15,28$.
(29) For Al a wiudgments, pumshments read, with Wild., Frank., following (6) $\mu \dot{d} \sigma \tau 1 \gamma \in S$ (cf. Job 21,9) )

20 (2) For $\mathfrak{A}$ ( 4 Chajes (p. 36) reads the command (of the king); better perhaps אמרי, as the plural is used exclusively in Proverbs.
(3) [It would perhaps be better to point, with Grätz, Frank.,
 Chajes' suggestion (p. 24) to read for $\mathfrak{A l}$, following 18,1 , deserves con- 40 sideration (a fool quarrels about everything, or better with every one).

 [cf., however, Crit. Notes on Ezra-Neh., p. 33, 1.28 and above, p. 45, 1. 45- - P. H.] $\mathfrak{A l}$ חnarose through dittography of the 1 ; read
(8) [The self before rendering a decision is called, in the cuneiform ritual tablets, kuss $\hat{\imath}$ da'áni (cf. IS 1,9; 4, 18); see Zimmern, Beitr. sur Babyl. Religion, p. 104, 1. 122.
(9) For the recurrence of the initial D in vv. 7-9 of. p. 54, 1. 31. - P. H.]
(1i) Instead of 组 (so, too, se ; according to BICK. it comes from 21,8 ) read 50

(16) נָהָ comes from 27, 13 .
 p. 214, Assyr. išu (1)eL., HW 310), idtu 'hand' (fem. ittu 'side', itti 'my side' = คֵֵ, ${ }^{\beta}$ originally p. 61, 1. 31. The nota accusativi nא (Lidz., p. 230) has no connection with the preposition (contrast Gho. Hoffmann, Phön. Insihr., 1889, p. 39), but is originally identical with $\begin{gathered}0 \\ \text {, ת , representing a form } i \text { ith (Punic yth; or ith (like }\end{gathered}$ bin 'son;' cf. Nöld., Mand. Gr., p. 294, n.) while nis= iath (contrast Delitysch, Proleg., p. 169 below), i.e. a form like damu 'blood.' The $\pi$ in $n k$ is just as irregular as the instead of $\underset{\sim}{*}$ in Arabic (Assyr. laš̌su, i. e. låsúu=
 20,$3 ;$ GGN $25 \mathrm{Ap} .{ }^{\prime} 83$, rot $)=\boldsymbol{\varkappa}$, so that the $\omega$ in Arabic would be quite regular, and the $\pi$ in the Heb. nota accusativi and Aram. リrw and $\pi$; (Nöld., Syr. $G r{ }^{2} \int 287$, n. 1$)^{8}$ would then have to be explained in the same way as the $n$

 was being, cf. Assyr. as'í 'living being, animal' (Del., HW $143^{\text {b }}$ ), and the nota accusativi was originally used only before pronominal suffixes like iina in Arabic and $k \hat{i} i d$ in Ethiopic; ${ }^{〔}$ the use of $n k$ before nouns $\eta$ is secondary.

The form for the second person, Heb. Trsik, should be diuka in Assyr., but instead of atuka (written attuka; of. DEL., HW 160 and above, 1. 9) we find kâtu, kâšu (DeL., HW 357 ${ }^{\text {a }}$, the pronominal suffix being prefixed. This is due to the influence of the forms for the first person, ati, ásí, alongside of which we have $\underset{\sim}{i} a t i$ and $i d a s i$. The initial $i$ is here undoubtedly identical with the $'$ in the Aramaic form of the nota accusativi $n_{i}$, but it produced the impression of the suffix of the first person -ia being prefixed. Therefore the final $i$-vowel con25 taining the suffix of the first person was no longer preserved but changed into $-u$ and $-a$, on the analogy of other nouns, and the suffix $-k a$ of the second person was prefixed, kâtu, kâ̌̌a instead of átuke, the feminine forms (kâti, kiâsí) being subsequently differentiated on the analogy of the personal pronoun,



19 (1) Instead of $\mathfrak{A}$ ו read vv. $1-3$ ) and 28,6 .


## Tsebuction

a That is, is, not 'is; see Beitr. 2. Assyr. 1, 260, n. 27; of. ibid. p. 328.
B The prepositon ns with is not a feminine form of the Assyr. preposition ina


$\gamma$ تil utham has, of course, no comnection with und. In Wruilt-1)E Goeje 2,83, below, it is explained as a modification of be an emphatic form of the precative of tü (DeL., HW $373^{b}$ below) just as the rare لات (Wright-de Goeje z, p. 96, below) appears to be an emphatic form of the negative ע. Cf. GGN 25 Ap. 183, p. 98, n. 2; Reckendorf $\$ 132$ and p. 709.

8 This remark has been misunderstood in Ges.-BUHL³, 82b. NÖLDEKE does not mean to say that A being is different from the nota accusativi; he only wants to emphasize the fact that the archaic use of $\mathbb{N}$ in cases like $-A_{0}$ (where $-\mathbb{A}_{0}$ $=$ Assyr. $\lambda^{a}(\hat{i})$ is different from the common reflexive use of $\mathbb{A}_{0}$.

- For $n=\mathscr{V}$ of. above, p. 50, L. 5 .
$\zeta$ In $\hat{i} \hat{j} \hat{a}$ and $k \hat{\jmath} \hat{j} \hat{a}$ the final consonant has been dropped, while the initial $k$ in Ethiopic represents a prefixed pronominal element.

ท Cf. Delitzsch, Prol., p. 117 below; HW 154a.
 gives a very feeble sense and stands, further, in no intelligible relationship with $26^{a}$; it also fails to explain the which indicates a climax. Of corrections (ישֶׁ (Dys.) or (Grätz, Toy) do not help at all. Read, with Kamph., following $\psi$ 3I, 24, ,




 For מלון Toy reads ins insolence.

(5) [At nאש should be pronounced תیשׂ; cf. above, p. 34, 1. 44. - P. H.]
(8) במתלּהםים as in 26,22; but the rendering dainty food is nothing but a guess, 15 and the form (part. Hithpael!) would certainly be very strange. LöHr (TLZ '99, col. 652) considers it to be miswriting for מַמַּקן (Cant. 5, 16; Neh. 8, io) brought about by the preceding למהתלמות in v. 6.

 who soothes him); CHAJES (p. 43) suggests non the courage of a man makes him endure suffering).
 For 끄의. 25,8.9 and Crit. Notes on Ezra-Neh., p. 66, 1. 37. - P. H.]

 also read, is, according to Pink., only a correction). Hitz.'s ingenious conjecture



(21) € in (so, too, §

For $\mathfrak{A l}$ 亿 following $\llbracket^{6}$ éovtal.
(24) Instead of $\mathfrak{A l}$ (in the usual interpretation ציצׁy neans one who has many comrades) read with Grätz, Frank., Toy, following इ®. According to the Masora parva $\boldsymbol{w}^{\prime \prime}$ might be expected here for as in 2S 14, 19 and Mic. 6, 10. [In Mic. 6, io we must read instead of all with Wellhausen, Nowack, Ges.-Buhl ${ }^{133}$, (RV, shall I be pure), at the beginning of the following verse, for which we 40 must point, with 3 numquid justificabo (AV, shall I count them pure) (

 Micha, p. 106, n. 2. It is not necessary to read the Hif. declarativum (Ryssex, p. 107): in Assyrian the Piel uzakkê is used in the meaning to declare 4 free (DEL., HW 254 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ ).
 the Masorah, but H. P. Smith and Ges.-Buhl ${ }^{\times 3}$ adopt Perles' suggestion, reading אָׁw instead of $\mathfrak{A} \boldsymbol{M}$; it would perhaps be better to read (Deut.

 to Thou hast 'cornered' me or thou hast hit the nail on the head.

As to in Prov. 18,24, it cannot be denied that may have been pro-
 sing．even in v．12） $\mathbb{\$ d}$ ；also בrs in v． $13^{\text {b }}$ agrees with the sing．［The plural， however，may be amplificative（םפלפם＝the great king，cven the greatest king）； cf．above，p．34，1．31．－P．H．］
（16）（so GräTz）；it should be struck out，following（6Se．［Contrast below，note on 30,13 ， p．67，1．4I．－P．H．］

 Em．，following（58（haplography）．

（30）For 4 ，we should perhaps，following Is．29，10；33，15，read ayy，with GräTz，
 to be nurroze，DEL．，HW 88a；but transposition of $x$ is not exceptional．－I＇．H．］

17 （5）For $\mathfrak{M} \boldsymbol{T}$ ？ to |  |
| :---: |
| n？？ |
| ） |

（7）CHAJES＇suggestion（p．28）to read her fat h deserves consideration．It goes without saying that pretentious speech is not proper for a fool．
 hence © avtiגorias éreipei mas kaкós．On the other hand，\＆renders ling
 as ש゙ッ？

 interpreted as for his neighbor．But 6 has tûv Éutoû pi入uv，and इ a：～w and 『 creditor（ $\boldsymbol{M}$ ），not to the debtor（ $\boldsymbol{\pi}$（ means to give security to another（not for another person）．For yา cf．18，17．A
 refers again to the creclitor，not to the debtor：U ن Uob Lil means I pledge myself to thee（not for thee）．To give security for a thing or for a man is
 may be construed also with $\varepsilon$ er or $ل(d)$ لا $ل$ ）or with the accusative （svil النّ he made him guarantee the thing）．In the same way 27 y is con－ 35 strued with the accusative of the person for whom security is given，of．11， 15 ；
 ל לפני האיש（in German，er ühernahm dem Manne gegenüber Bürgschaft für scinen
 27y to become surdy for a person may be construed either with the accusative or 40 with the prepositions $\beth, \boldsymbol{\zeta}$ ，or $\boldsymbol{b}$ ．The correct explanation of our passage is given in Deirtzsch＇s commentary，who quotes FLeISCHFR＇s translation apud altirum （sc．creditorem pro dehiture）．Tor renders，who becomes secturity to another，and adds，＂The another refers to the creditor．To another is lit．in the presence of his neighbor．＂See also Ges．－BuHL ${ }^{13}$ s．ข．27．－P．H．］
（21）For the participle 7 b4 as casus pendens，which is，at the same time，equivalent to a conditional clause（as in Gen．9，6），of．Ges．－Kautzsch $\int 116$, w．
Al it in（so，too，\＄）would mean（it happens）to his sorroue．Probably，how－ ever，the $\}$ is only a dittngram of the $\}$ preceding；hence 688 úvn，© $\mathbb{C}$ ． ［The prefixed $\zeta$ ，however，might be emphatic in this case；see above，p．48，1．15． 50 $-\mathrm{P} . \mathrm{H}_{\text {．}}$
（22）An（so，too，apparently（5）according to the usual interpretation＝healing ； read，with DYS．， $\operatorname{ny}$ ，following $\$$ Leecs and © KD12．

Prov．

14 but the conjecture מּan plans their destruction (Hitz., Dys., Toy) is not successful.
 would then have a natural antecedent which is lacking in the Received Text.

 Kamph., Frank., Toy, Oort, Em.
(33) The tenor of $\mathfrak{A l}$ in the second hemistich is not without difficulty; but to insert


 should read, with JÄG., Grätz, following (6. Eגa.ббovoūl, 7 n ( $c f .28,22$ ); see, however, 25 , 1o.
(35) (Frank.) as in 15,8; 16,13; in that case the $\zeta$ prefixed to the following subject would have to be taken as the emphatic b (cf. Crit. Notes 15 on Ezra-Nehemiah, p. 58, 1.20 and below, p. 49, 1. 50; p. 52, 1. 11). The construction is the same as in $15,10^{\mathrm{a}} .24^{\mathrm{a}}, \& \mathrm{c} . ;$; |
If $\mathfrak{f l}$ תהחה were a sound reading, we would expect after it למביש. Dys.'s and

 it to מביש.

15 (2) The conjecture ${ }^{2}$ (Dys. notice as it corresponds to the parallel much better than $\mathfrak{M}$ תִּיטיב
 Kautzsch § $118, \mathrm{~g}$; contrast Crit. Notes on Ezra-Nehemiah, p. 71, 1. 25); but (6


入oûvtal.

 p. 90, 1. 32; p. 115, 1. 31; contrast ibid. p. 109, 1. 7. - P. H.]
(I4) Instead of the K'thitb (which comes from in with $\mathfrak{a x}$.
(15) For ומוב it is perhaps better to read, with Toy, ולשוב

(24) (cf. Eccl. 3,21) may be subsequent additions. The omission of S before
 are \&c.
(28) (2) לב צדיק יהנה לעענות] cannot mean The righteous considers his word (Tov) or das Herz des Gerechten denkt nach, wenn es antworten will (Ges.-BuHL ${ }^{13}$ s. v. הג) but the mind of the righteous meditates ( $f .24,2$ ) a response, tries to give a favorable answer (cf. below, p. 66, 1. 33); 3 mens justi meditatur obedientiam. 45 GräTZ suggested (עֲ עֲ עֲ (denkt tugendhaft). - P. H.]
(31) Instead of $\mathfrak{A l}$ (so, too, $\mathbb{C}$; in (fa the verse is missing; cf. LAG. on v. $27^{\text {b }}$ ) Hitz. suggests חכm; but this makes poor sense.

(Ii) Very attractive is Frank.'s conjecture פלם וטאונים טשפט ליהוה steelyard and scales are judgment for JHVH, i. e., the employment of false balances will be judged by Jhvi.

14 （1）For 爪t Delitzsch，Dis．，Wild．，Strack，Toi；OORT，Eim．，on the analogy of 1,$20 ; 9,1$ ； ［cf．above，p．34，1．31．－P．H．］．能 םex is an explanatory gloss（so Toy）．
（3）For fll nita Hitz．，Frank．read nis；cf． $10,13$.
Instead of the grammatically impossible（if．（sES．KAl＂1\％SCH $\$ 47, \mathrm{~g}$ ） （ Al read ament with ©Se and Hitz．，Lagarde，Oort，Em．
（4）For at diz Krochmal，（see Grätz），Frank．，Chajes，Toy read dew（without oxen there is no grain）．
 literally it runs Go from the presence of a foolish man，and thou dost not knowe 10

 bear in mind，however，that taje does not necessarily mean frome the presence
 ＇ man，and thou wilt not know lips of knowledge，i．e．，If you are in constant
 you will not learn very much．－P．H．］
（9）All means literally，but without the least connection with the second half of the verse，the guilt－offering mocks at fools．Quite differently（5）（and \＄） 20


（1i）An nִּ：；similarly © and probably $\$ 10 \div 1$ will rejoice presupposes the same reading．Against this $(\mathfrak{F}$ otijoovtal and $\$ 11$ ， 12，7 7．
（13）For the grammatically impossible $\mathbb{A}$（with ©）（c）the case in Is． 17，6，which is quite analogous，and Ges．－KAUTZSCH， $\int 131, n$ ，note 1 ）it is cer－ tainly an easy correction，taking the $\pi$ over to $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ ；so Hitz．，Dys．，Bick．，Wild．，Chajes．According to Jäg．this was the reading of （6）but that is uncertain，as is，also，the reading of $\$$ ．let since the article here would be very strange，must rather be due to a mistaken repetition from v．12 ${ }^{\text {b }}$ ．Cf．below，note on 16,13 ．
（14）Instead of the meaningless at mead with Capplelus，Del．，Bick．， Kamph．，Frank．，Strack，Toy，Oort，Em．；$¢$ ．Jer．17，10；Zech．1，4．6． 6 d $\pi \dot{\delta}$


 p．34，1．46．－P．H．］occurs in OT．Toy，following $\mathfrak{6} \pi 0 \lambda \lambda d$ úmo甲é $\rho \in 1$ ，suggests N＂：；but $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda \alpha \dot{1}$ ，which is almost indispensable，is an arbitrary addition．

（22）CHAJES（p．16，note c）proposes to read in $22^{\mathrm{b}}$ ： shall be with them that deaise groed．Perhaps we should insert，with Tor，$b$ be－
 and truth，see Crit．Notes on Psalms，p．80，1．27；of．Toy＇s Comm．on Prov．， p．295．－P．H．］
$\qquad$
$\qquad$20 0 10


$\qquad$

[^4]－

Ges．－Kautzsch \＆ $145, \mathrm{u}$ ．Nor can $\boldsymbol{Z}$ be construed as feminine．According to ALBRECHT（ZAT 16，81）the K ${ }^{e}$ thîb should be pointed
 be explained as a＂rhythmical＂jussive at the beginning of the clause；of．the numerous instances in Ges．－Kautzsch § 109，k．
 Bick．，Kamph．，Wild．，Strack；of．Job 39，8．
（27）For $\mathfrak{A}$ 解
（28）Instead of All read נעי For（so $\mathfrak{A l}$ according to the best evidence，of．Bär，Liber Proverbiorum，io p．40；meaning no－death）read with all the Ancient Versions and almost all commentators；only Bertheau，Del．，and probably Baumg．，are opposed．

I3（1）Since All renders，the verb governing it must have dropped out．© forces sense with 15 מקבל מרותות ；an equally violent rendering of $\mathfrak{A l}$ is attempted by（ 6 （so，too，\＄）

 coming first，$\psi \psi$ II， 7 ；99，4；［contrast Crit．Notes on Isaiah，p．136，1．35－P．H．］
（4）Instead of $\mathfrak{M}$ ，ַַpen，which is grammatically impossible（it could be explained 20
 with Dys．，BICK．，Oort，Em．；in $(\mathbb{5} \mathbb{S}$ the verse runs quite differently．
（6）For fll ת
（9）Grätz and Toy read بְ！：shines brightly，following 2 K 3，22；Is．58，10，\＆c．，in－ stead of $\mathfrak{A l}$ ？
（io）Instead of $\mathfrak{A l p}$（so，too，© ）we would expect a participle，as a subject must be expressed； $\mathfrak{G S}$ Kakó $\varsigma=$ Il（so，since Vogel，most commentators；PINK．thinks that it is rather pq ）is certainly not original．
For $\mathfrak{A l}$（ A Frank．prefers with the lowly（cf．11，2）．This is probably right since in all other passages means nothing but to take counsel，to con－ 30 sult with others．［So，too，OORT，Em．－P．H．］
（II）מהבל（so，too，\＆®），according to the usual but linguistically impossible render－ ing，（gained）by fraud，is evidently a transcriptional error for ban；© oтoubaZouévn＝מְּחָל（VOGEL and almost all commentators）；of．20，21 Qe＇rê．
（I3）For an we should perhaps read，with Frank．，following（6）úrıaivel，wẹ 35 zvill keep well，will be safe．Cf． 11,31 where
（15）Instead of $\mathfrak{A l}$ read
（16）Instead of $\mathfrak{M}$ every prudent man read beve with Kamph．；cf．16，4．
（17）For 肘
肌（so，too，（6\＄）falls into evil；the context absolutely requires（hence even 40 Luther bringt Unglück）לọ！＇；so Arnoldi，Now．，Dys．，Bick．，Kamph．，Wild．， Frank．，Strack，Oort，Em．
（19）The first and second hemistichs of this verse are not parallel；two hemistichs have probably dropped out between them．
 similarly the second $K^{e}$ thîb， second imperative as expression of the certain consequence of an action（thus thou wilt become wise．）（f．Ges．－KaUTZSCH § 110 ，f．
 God must be understood as subject，read with Ew．，Kamph．，Toy，follow－ 50 ing（6）кata入n$\mu \psi \in \tau \alpha 1$ ；of．the same translation of Deut．28，45 and often；the parallelism with ת ת ת is exact．
（22）［For predestined see above，note on 2，7．－P．H．］

II（19）Instead of the strange just（as？）of $\mathfrak{m}$（so，too，©） $6 \$$ and Dis．，Bick．read，no less strangely，
廿 37，3．［Cf．also OORT，Em．


（28）For fil（so，too，（5st）read his？with Ew．，DYS．，OORT，Em．，and the parallelism． Notice the plene written form as regularly in the case of biz：
Al

 arbitrary addition $\varphi$ úє $\tau \alpha$ ．
 ）So LaG，renders，according to whom is to be expunged as an attempt to correct שめコ．Cf．Crit．Notes on Isaiah，p．90，1．7． 15

（31）For fit（so， $100, \mathbb{C}$ ）© offers $\mu$ óגıs．This is most probably right，but the Hebrew equivalent cannot be reached；Grätz suggests wẹn，but that means almost．［In order to give פמעם the required meaning harally，scaricly，it is nec－ essary to insert the negative，במעם לא ；in modern IIcbrew this combination 20

 is quoted in I P＇eter 4，18．fit represents of course an intentional alteration， for dogmatic purposes，of the original text；$c f$ ．below，1．43．－P．H．］ Instead of \＆ロe：（so，too，©）read，with（5．

 ［For iby of．Crit．Notes on Isaiah，p．122，1．51；but we should perhaps read （Assyr，ebotru，DEL．，HW 11 ${ }^{\text {b }}$ ，below）；$f$ ．Josh．5， 11.12 （P）．－P．H．］


 מצוּד Is．29，7；Ez．19，9（cf． 3 munimentum pessimorum）．An עen before 7is may be a misplaced variant to（if．below，p．56，1．48；p．57，1．51）．－P．H．］ 35


 DORPF）حسصـ．
（13）For tit שpio（cf．20，25；29，6）we should perhaps read epis cntungles himself，with 40 Grätz，Kamph．，Wild．，TOY，OORT，E゙m．，following 6，2 and（5；Dys．reads שipt．
（14） $\mathrm{Al}+\boldsymbol{\mathrm { bl }}$（so，too，（5SX）is a mistaken limitation of a general statement；［ $[\%$ above， 1． 23 and p． $44,1.35$ ；also p．41，1． 35 and p． $62,1.6$ ．－P．H．］
 below，p． $52,1.44$ ；p． $55,1.35$ and Crit．Notes on Numbers，p．43，1． 31.
 Tbx לn may be translated：the man told us refeatedly；a zuitmess is a person who repeats the facts of a case．Afterwards the stem ty to repiart，to reiterate came to mean to makic a solimen decharation（תaty）；cf．Assyr．ws＇id（Diel．， 1 W $32^{\text {b }}$ ）；the translation testimony for is incorrect．－P．H．］
 in which a masculine predicate is used after a feminine subjoct are either due to special reasons（anacoluthon \＆．c．）or are textually suspicious；of．the list in





 ף


For the corrupt $\mathfrak{A y}$ ， （cf．25，4；for 26,23 see below，p．62，1．46）or בדיצ（Is．1，25）；but neither




means throughout preferable and is nowhere used attributively，but is always participial predicate；of．above，p．4I，1．II．－P．H．］
 the beginning of the first hemistich；Toy prefers תועַ．
（24）Only God could be subject of A1 ，，but He has not been mentioned previously， 20



（29）filant，but the abstract noun is strange．Read，with $\mathfrak{G}$ and in accordance with the parallelism， and $^{2}$ ； $\mathbb{E}$ express the same but in the plural．Perhaps 25 we should disregard the accentuation and combine，with Frank．，following 13， 6 ；

（31）In this transposition，which is suggested by the sense，we follow Hirzig．
II（3）Read the $Q^{e} \mathrm{e} \hat{e}$, ， perf．meant？）is simply a transcriptional blunder．
（6）For חn Toy prefers and following（6sex；this is grammatically easier，but mars the rhythm．［Perhaps we should read min；cf．19，13；Lam．4，20．－P．H．］
（7）The first hemistich is evidently too long；肌 ע רֶup（so，too，\＄区）seems added in order to prevent the offense that might be taken at a statement that this took 3 place at the death of every man［Eccl．9，4］．（6avoids the difficulty by adding ציצ，



 （5）Taris．Toy，however，gives as an alternative．

 meaninglessly，kaтúp $\theta$ wбєv．Lag．suggests for this：katwpxض̆ซato．（6）jumped from pond to popped out，in consequence，vv． $10^{b}$ and $11^{a}$ ．The addi－

 ascribes $10^{a} .11^{b}$ and 12.13 to the same source．
（12）［For the recurrence of the initial $ב$ in vv． $9-12$ of．below，p．54，1．31．－P．H．］
（16）The second and third hemistichs of this verse are added from（65 against fie， 50

Instead of AI ועריצים（so，too，\＄ with（厅 divopeiot and Hitz．，Ew．，Bickell．

6 (3) (so, too, 6ST) seems to be an unnecessary clause. If it be original, we must, with BICK., presuppose that a corresponding second hemistich has been lost.
 Bpóxwv) St. PERLF:S (Analekton, 1895, p. 52) and Wild. read 7aye, which would suit the parallelism very well.
(7.8) [Verses 7 and $8^{a}$ must be combined so as to form one line. To improve the rhythm


V. $8^{\text {b }}$ is a gloss on $8^{\text {a }}$. - P. H.]


(14) By transposing, with DYS., the from ny to yn we get two well-balanced hemistichs. [yา, however, is superfluous and mars the rhythm; it would be better to omit it (so Bick., Toy); cf. above, p. 35, 1. 38. - P. H.] $K^{e}$ thîb, as in v. 19,
(16) The sense requires the $Q^{c} r e ̂$ תבֵּ taken combination of seven abominations.


IO (4) For $\mathfrak{A l}$ שרָ we should perhaps read, with Frank., following 6,11; 30,8, שי and

(6) The second hemistich is read by Ge in general as by fl. Bick. conjectures in-
 obj. and $\begin{gathered}\text { an as subj. (Pinkuss). }\end{gathered}$
 but The name of the just will be used as a blessing (cf. Gen. 12,2); 72! is simply a synonym of $\begin{array}{r}\underline{W} \\ \text { just as Assyr. sikru (DeL., HW 255 }\end{array}$ In the second hemistich we must read, with Krochmal, Grätz, 2p゙1 (Frank. 30 2Pझリ), instead of fll 2pl? (contrast Job 5, 3); cf. also OORT, Em. - P. H.]
 or is yר! (cf. $\psi 106,32$ ).
(10) וֹA (so, too, ©) is evidently repeated by mistake from v. $\mathrm{S}^{\text {b }}$. 5 (and so §) $\delta \delta \epsilon \in$ Eג $\epsilon$ rxw $\mu \in \tau \dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \beta \dot{\rho} \eta \sigma i \alpha \varsigma ~ \epsilon i p \eta v o \pi o t \epsilon \hat{1}$, which perhaps means, ac- 35
 (cf. Is. 27,5) (מוכיח יעשה שלום. Ewald's suggestion (in which GräTz agrees, only changing (o) seems most defensible. On behalf of the text of 5 it can be urged that the parallelism in cc. 10 to 22,16 is almost everywhere antithetic. [Perhaps we should read: ומוכיח בלב פתוח ישלׁים. - P. H.]

(17) [at whould be pointed as participle, nk, corresponding to in the second hemistich (so Frank.). - P. H.]
 falsike Mauler decken IIuss). This is undoubtedly easier than fil so far as the 45 syntax is concerned. 'would have the same meaning; of. Is. 14, II; 23,18. [In the same way mope in Lev. 3,3 \&c. seems to have been a substantive and not a participle; ff. Dillm.-RysSel and Bäntsch ad loc. - P. H.]
(20) At טyמ can hardly be original; © Ekגєiчfє, \& $\|_{i} \infty \infty$, © seem to have read differently. [Following (6 úprupos $\pi \in \pi \cup \rho \omega \mu \dot{\prime} v o s ̧$ we might be inclined to substitute
 would hardly have been corrupted to 7 רנב. The original text must have been (so, too, GRÄTZ in his Emend.). The two verbs, ן $\ddagger$ and $ף 79$, are combined

8 （29）Instead of $\mathfrak{A l}$ In，which seems to have been introduced in error from v．27，
 ש．
בחוקו מוסדי ארץ a hemistich seems to be lacking．BICK，strikes out ארץ as a variant to the second hemistich of v .27 ．
（30）［For $\mathfrak{A}$ we must read nursling（AV one brought up），pass．part．to the act．
 strikes out שעושועים having a dittogram out of which has resulted，by been taken over from v．3I，a very strangely expressed piece of tautology．
（3I）［V． 3 I seems to be a gloss．
（32）The second hemistich of v． 32 must be transposed： $32^{\mathrm{b}}$ and $34^{\mathrm{a}}$ go together；of． Toy ad loc．and Oort，Em．
（32．33）The first hemistich of v． 32 goes with $33^{\mathrm{a}} ; 33^{\mathrm{b}}$（ $\mathbf{( 1 )} \mathrm{V}$ ת $5 \times 1$ ）must be omitted as an interruptive gloss．The order of the hemistichs in $\mathscr{G}^{\mathrm{V}}$ is $32^{\mathrm{a}} \cdot 34^{\mathrm{a}} \cdot 32^{\mathrm{b}} \cdot 34^{\mathrm{b}} \cdot 34^{\mathrm{c}}, 15$ while 33 is omitted．－P．H．］





（3）［תקרא על גפּ מרמי קרת must belong to $3^{\text {b }}$ ，，but make the second hemistich too long；עלט should probably be canceled as a gloss or variant to＇略，though


Cf．Assyr．agappu，gappu，kappu＇wing＇（DeL．，HW 17 ${ }^{2} \cdot 203^{\mathrm{a}} \cdot 340^{2}$ ）．The primi－ tive form of the word for wing was gadpu；this became，with assimilation of the $d$ （cf．above，p．35，1．34），gappu；with partial assimilation of the initial $g$ to the final $p$（cf．below，p．61，1．4；p．65，1．36）kappu；and with resolution of the 30 doubling（Del．，Ass．Gr．$\$ 5$ 2），kanpu，ף32．Cf．Schulthess，l．c．，p．17．－P．H．］
 （ $\mathrm{I}^{\text {st }}$ sing．cohor．）；according to Pink．this may be what is meant by $\%$ ！o in $\mathbb{D}$. Cf．v． 16.
（ $7-10$ ）Although read by 用 and ©st these verses are a later insertion，as GräTz saw． They do not address the simple as do vv．4－6 and II ff；further，כin v．II joins excellently with v． 6.


（13）肌 ת קat but instead of this abstract noun，which is very strange here，read， 40

For 品（for the meaning anything we might，perhaps，refer to 2 S 18，22；Job 13，13；cf．Ges．－Kau＇rzsch § 137，c）read，with JäG．，Hitz．，Grätz，Lag．，Oort，
 like $\mathbb{\mathbb { C }}$ ，have set some expression which appealed to him in the place of the 45 colorless Tb）．§ ：© ©




6 （1）Instead of the plur．T＇男
 with Oort，Toy，following（夭x $\chi$ € $\ \lambda \eta$ ，

(4) [For the plur. ם of. $\psi$ 141,4; Is. 53,3; see, however, Cheine and Marti ad loc. - P. H.]
(5) (A) in both hemistichs is strange; Grätz and BICK. read in the second

(6) For AI ניצ, which is doubeful, GRÃtz, Tor read cing verity, as in v. 9.
(7) Toy conjectures, following 12,22 , (תועבתי (or רצעבה לי שמתי רשם).
(ro) Instead of an my instruction read, with שST, OORT, and TOr, 7 ºp. [The second hemistich, ורעת מַחרוץ , does not mean And knoweldyse rather than choice geld (so AV, DEL. et scientian prae auro lectissimee); ; is 10
 must be explained in the same way) in which pho is placed before for the sake of emphasis. The following ${ }^{\prime} y$, at the beginning of v .1 s , is confirmative (not $=$ for, but $=$ indeed). . ורעו is accusative dependent on $\operatorname{mp}$. Cf. p. 44, 1. 16.
(12) Antant which makes the first hemistich too long, may be scribal expansion.-P. 11.] 15
 aterstehe mich auf Klugheit, I am acquainted wenth prwtence, I am an expert in
 nominative verb, derived from Jer. 6,$21 ; \Psi 31,12$ ); שכנת ערמה mcans I live clese by, am will aiquainted with, 20
 וידוע חלי is practically equivalent to אני שכנתי ערמה $7,4^{\text {b }}$ מדֶע לבּינה אקרא . Cf. also Is. 53, 3. - P. H.]

 context; Bick., who also puts v. I3 after v. 17, strikes it out as a gloss.
(14) Instead of 弗 I am understanaing; I have might, we have prob-
 or, at any rate, with OORT, Toy, אנו בינה א \% would be on the analogy of numerous genuine Semitic nominal clauses expressing the identity or absolute 30 congruity of subject and predicate (cf. Ges.-Kautzsch $\$ 141, \mathrm{c} . \mathrm{d}$ ), but here contrary to the context. $\mathbb{C}$ has simply

 with $6 \mathbf{5}$ e. Ew. points to v. 11 where also Wistlom speaks of itself in the $3^{d} 35$ pers. According to Hisid. the $\mathrm{K}^{\mathrm{e}}$ thîb is a dogmatic correction intended to prevent the use of the verse in defense of the Christian $\lambda$ óros doctrine; the Torah enters in the place of Wisdom. [Cf. below, p. 45, 1. 24; p. 66, 1. 14.

(19) For נבחר see above, 1. 11. - P. H.]
(24) $\mathfrak{M}$ (2n apposition to strange grammatically and in sense; strictly speaking, it can mean nothing but the most homored among the zeaters (c). Is.




(26) $\mathfrak{A}$ (so, too, sie and also $(\mathbb{F}$, if it did not read (שאר) does not give a satisfactory sense.
 p. 137, 1. i3. The p may be due to the influence of $v .29^{b}$ where pana was cor- 50 rupted to בהוקו; see below, p. 42, 1. 2. - P. H.]
(28) Instead of ath my read, with (6xe and OORT, Joy, myan, according to the usage of infinitives with suffixes in vv. 27-29.
 throughout in vv. 6.7 the 3 fem . for the 1 pers.), and $\mathbb{\text { b has }}$ מן כi:nc

 doubtful; perhaps we should readippollowing (I, Kamph., Wild., STRACK ; cf. v. 12.
 quently used in the Evangel. Hierosol, with the meaning time; but this usage may be derived from the passages in Proverbs.
(10) $\mathfrak{M}$ 2
 Pinkuss). [Oort, Em. suggests - P. H.]
(ii) Instead of $\boldsymbol{4}$ (cf. Cant. 3,2.3) gadding about.
 beautiful. Read, with OORT, טוית

 ק'פעין) we will embrace.
(22) For all akna, which is doubtful, Dys., Wild. prefer to read iñañ, following (6) $\kappa \in \pi \varphi \omega \theta \epsilon i \varsigma ;$ the article, however, would be peculiar, and the part. $\pi$.
 ロאת to be an adverb from the same stem ( $=$ like a simpleton); cf. below, 1. 50.

(22.23) After $\mathrm{Ek} \boldsymbol{\mathrm { s }}$, at the end of the first hemistich, the second hemistich has fallen out, as the parallelism shows; $22^{b}$ b in V. 23. V. $23^{\circ}$ (ילא ידע בי בנפשו הוא) coming after a hemistich that has now dropped out, formed the close of the period, as 9,18 shows. $22^{\mathrm{c}}$ (כעֶכם אל טוסר אויל and like a fetter for the correction of a fool) and $23^{\text {a }}$ (עד יפַלח חק vintil the arrow cleaves his liver) in $\{l$ are hopelessly corrupt. Nor does (6 kai
 too, se) help us out. Perhaps has come from a parallel to wi, so 3 Grätz; cf. Is. 53,7. [Ruben, Crit. Remarks on some Passages of OT (London,
 to read in ומעֶup and as a hart that is caught oino the fetter. He takes An kn, at the end of v. 22, to be a corrupt repetition of and, following LaG.,
 149,8) which is a gloss on Al may be a contraction of sex, cf. Syr.
 written alike (see Del., HW $32^{\text {b }} \cdot 4^{8{ }^{\text {b }} \text { ) } a-a-l u \text {. It is possible, however, that one }}$ of these words does not represent her hart but ibex; see my remarks in
 stall, which is very improbable. Perhaps we should arrange the hemistichs in the following order: -

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { במהתר צורור אל פח } \tag{45}
\end{align*}
$$

After her the simpleton follows,. not knowing his life is at stake,
Like an ox that goes to the slaughter, like a bird rushing into a snare,
Like a hart to the grip of the trap, till its liver is cleaved by the arrow.
Transposition of and was suggested long ago by Delitzsch. For אויל kor
of. $\mathbf{1 3}$, 6,5 .
pleton, this arrant fool); cf. above, p. 34, 1. 31. - P. H.]
 is Al $^{2}$ with $\mathfrak{G E}$; BICk.
 vitae non ambulant．It is impossible to take，with Ges．－BUHL，${ }^{13}$ s．v．p， $\mathfrak{m}$ as a prefixed final clause subordinated to ${ }^{\text {b }}$ ．The appeal to Amharic syntax（KÖnig，Syntax，$\$ 414, \mathrm{t}$ ）does not help matters．

In $\psi \psi 5^{8}, 3 ; 78,50$ פלם secms to stand for （see above，p．38，1．41）：in $\psi 78,50$
 fecit，$\$$ uid，while in $\psi 58,3$ the Piel may be causative $=$ cause to make way，or
 justice，or in idiomatic German：öfnen der Ungerechtigkeit Thïr und Thor
 migravit．（P．S．－Cf．Peiser in his OLZ 3，451，n．6．）

In the three passages in Prov，however，Dbo undoubtedly corresponds to Assyr．DלD to regard，consider；and nowhere in OT does mbean to weigh．The original meaning of steelyard may be indicator．－P．H．］
（22）（AI（so，too，2せ），evidently an explanatory gloss to the preceding suffix； 15 it appeared necessary because v． 21 did not speak of the godless exclusively．

 some similar verb，［probably TDO，cf．13，23；Gen．19，15；Num．16，26；in all


6 （1－19）For the notes on vv．1－19 see below，p．42，11． 51 ff ．
（22）V． 22 is，with B1CK．and others，to be inserted after v． 23 （cf．on the transposition 7，3．4）；תת \＆c．are evidently predicates of מורח and In the transposition of the verses the first hemistich has fallen out．
 7וטו； 1 and $n$ have changed places．

 of the strange woman（cf．AV）．
（26）For the first hemistich $\quad$ ．．．． 9 （5）（also \＆and，essentially，『）offers тו川ウ
名 for the price of a harlot is the price of a loaf of bread．
（27）［For הnח see below，p．6I，1．35．－I＇．H．］
（29）（so，too，（55 and，essentially，§e）is an explanatory gloss to vv．27． 35 28，and，as such，is struck out by Bickell．
（30）For $\mathfrak{A}$ ※ Wild．，Frank．read $\mathfrak{k}$ ；；ir dropped out owing to the preceding in at the end of v．2）（haplography）；the traditional rendering Mcn do not despise a thief is certainly very strange．
M בyvi（so，too，（5Sd）is an element too many and an evident gloss inter－ 40 preting נפשׂ on the basis of passages like Is．58，10．It disagrees with v． 31 and is struck out by Bickeld．
（35）［＇2 is here concessive，as in Eccl．4， $14^{\mathrm{a}}=\mathrm{y}$ פ Is． 1,15 or a y y Eccl． $4,14^{\mathrm{b}}$ ；cf． the translation of Eccl．4，13－16 in note 23 of my lecture on Ecclesiastes，Orien－ tal Studies，Boston，1894，p．272；see also Ges．－KAUTZSCH $\uparrow 160$, b．－P．H．］ 45

[^5]
 probably read $\boldsymbol{n}$ Tַ，and took to Jïg．and Bick．© 6 read
（5）Perhaps is to be inserted，with Oort，before

 have Tisp，as meaning soul（Lag．；of．Wellhausen＇s translation of the Psalms， p．187，1．27）；see，however，Crit．Notes on Genesis，p．107，1． 5 1．

 Èं $\theta$ שoviv，－in all probability an arbitrary addition of a verb，after had appeared in the text．The parallelism requires something like and thy hard－ won gain an alien snatch away．OORT suggests לבי＇；Frank．omits a before בית בית בית נמכי as subject，corresponding to the first hemistich．

（17）According to Frank．we should read $S_{N}$ instead of $\ldots$ ．
（18）［Verses 18－20 give the explanation of the allegorical language in $\mathrm{vv} .15-17$（just as Is． $\mathbf{5 1}, 10^{\mathbf{2}}$ explains the mythological allusions in the preceding line $\mathbf{5 1}, 9^{c}$ ）；cf． my lecture on Ecclesiastes，p． $20=$ Oriental Studies（Boston，1894）p．261．－ 20 P．H．］
（19）Read，with Graec．Ven．ai taútns pi入íal，Hitz．，Oort，following 7，18，तु The reading the whole section（so explicitly in Midrash Mishle from v． 15 on）as bearing on the study of the Torah（her breasts will nourish thee；cf．Heid．）
 third hemistich in the verse．It is evidently a kind of softening gloss to $19^{\text {b }}$ ．
（20）The first hemistich is overloaded；we should probably，with Dys．，omit $\mathfrak{A l}$ ， following（6；cf．1， 15 ．
（21）［用 means neither He weighs all his paths（Toy；RVM weigheth carefully，AV He pondereth all his goings，Graec．Ven．kai $\pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \alpha \varsigma \tau \grave{\varrho} \varsigma$ àvaбtpopàs aủtoo ta入avetúti），nor He makes plane（Toy，alt．，Del．，Kamph．，Wild．；RV maketh level），but He watches all his tracks，observes all his doings（3 omnes

 or rather the Nif．naplusu，is a common Assyr．word for regard，observe，notice， consider．Ziegler（1791）translated correctly：auf alle ihre Lebensbahnen blickt er scharf，comparing Job 34，21：：כי עיניו על דרפי איש｜｜וכל צעדיי יראה．

For the Assyr．stem db see Zimmern，Babyl．Busspsalmen，p．17；Del．，HW 528a；cf．also post－Biblical and Aramaic בלש inspect，examine，search；Syr．ald 40 investigate \＆c．，which is different from ads to break through＝Assyr．פלש（Del．， HW 529；Beitr．z．Assyr．1， $177^{\text {a }}$ s．v．nîpisưu）：perfodit is a genuine Syriac word，but alo perquisivit（as well as Aram．בלש）seems to be an Assyrian loan－ word．（In Schulthess＇Homonyme Wurzeln this stem is not discussed．）

In Is．26，7 should be rendered：The 45 way of the just is plain，｜｜Thou watchest the steps of the upright（w，which follows מישרים in Al，must be substituted for in the second hemistich；con－ trast（夭）．מפפלם מענל צדיקים is nearly equivalent to יורע דרך צדיקים He gives heed to the course of the righteous in $\psi \mathbf{1}, 6$ ．
 steps，and mank in 5，6（left untranslated by Frank．）must be ex－ plained in the same way ； on $\mathfrak{A l}$ ם פן
 would make the first hemistich too long unless we omit היה as dittogram of הוּ (cf. Crit. Notes on Ezekiel, p. 52, 1. 52).
(27) For all טמבע, which is somenhat peculiar, Tov reads Tyyy from thy neighbor; [OORT, Em., ן

 agreement with the imp. sing. which follows.
(30) Instead of 组 $K^{\mathrm{e}}$ (hîb (mediee 1) quarrel does not occur.
 DEL. and NOW. but following 24,19 and $\psi 37,1$ (7), ,
(3ł) Instead of $\mathfrak{A l}$, of the $b$ led to the change of $\mathrm{a} y$ to ax .
 cannot be opposed to the ? in the first hemistich of the verse; it should be those bending humbly before God. Cf. below, p. 49, 1. 8 and Rahlps, '2y und isy in den Psalmen, Göttingen, 1892.
(35) Wild. conjectures, following Hos. 4,7, ופְ but the glory of the fools shall be changed into shame; Toy suggests שיוֹ or vil.

 of Al , as it now exists, are fragments of $v .7$ which originally (see next note) followed v. 5. וחוח was added at the end of v. 4 to comp.ete the line after the 25 connection with $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{K}}$ had been broken.
(6.7) Al (and so, too, \$() reads v. 6 before v. 7 although the suffixes in v. 6 can only refer to בינה בכמה M. V. 7 is lacking in $\mathscr{G}$, yet is not a gloss, as OORT thinks; it had dropped out of the archetype of $\mathfrak{A}(\mathbb{G}$, was entered later on the margin, and came in $\operatorname{sl}$ to stand in the wrong place.
(13) For me במוסר (50 Tox); either can be right.



(I6) Al Kethîb ציכשי, Qeê 35 (BICK.); ע עבדין תיקלא presupposes Qerê; \$ , (so rightly Pink.; Heid. re-translates: 'משיל'; but the Hif. can hardly be supported with Job 25,2 ). The true reading is obscure; OORT guesses Inソer.
(18.19) V. 19 must be inserted before v. 18, following HITz. and DEL, and against Anse. Otherwise we should have, at least, to strike out the 1 before $\pi$ as a 40 dittogram of the preceding 9 .
(21) Read Al w? (in 3,21 1 ?י) means, according to the usual view, let them not depart!

 ing of the verse, is a witness for the conjecture bir.

(26) For bhee below, p. 38, 1. 50.

5 (2) The first hemistich has probably reached us incomplete; to read, with Bick., 50
 be an arhitrary addition. DYS. joins to niv, at the end of the first hemistich, nylu at the beginning of the second; he then further arbitrarily supplements the
 tear them out．Siegfried（TLZ＇99，col．329）suggests mpp？will be wiped away （cf．6，33）．Or should we read in in the first hemistich，so that the 3 plur． impf．would be used in both hemistichs for the passive as in Aramaic（Ges．－ Kautzsch $\int$（ $44, \mathrm{~g}$ ）？
 will not be drawn to further occurrences of this．
（3）The third hemistich of the verse，ala \＄ $\mathbb{C}$ ，is to be struck out，with $\mathfrak{G}$ ，OORT，Bick．；it is a gloss from 7,3 ．
（4）For $\mathfrak{A l}$ b ロe good repute．
（8）All to thy navel（so，too，© $\mathbb{C}$ ）is rather strange in spite of Del．and BaUmg．
 p．34，1． 44 and below，1．42）or לִבשׁׂT．Agreement with Ketthîb speaks for 15 the first（Hitz．，Oort）；4，22，for the second（Clericus，Grätz，Bick．，Frank．， Strack，Toy）．

（II） $\mathfrak{m}$ ב should probably be omitted，with Toy，as（early）scribal insertion；cf． 1,15 ．
（12）with Oort，following the context； $\mathfrak{A l}$ וּנָ which can only mean and even 20
 with חיציח．But as only the Qal and Hifill occur of the stem we should have at least to read，with Bick．，Frank．，Strack，Toy，ציָּאִּ

（13）For Al ans at the beginning of the second hemistich we should probably read， 25 with Kamph．，Wild．，Oort，Em．，צגוש，（cf．6，12；Is．2，9，\＆c．）or，with Toy，
（15）Al Kethîb

（18）［ $\left[\begin{array}{rl}0 \\ \Pi\end{array} \boldsymbol{\eta}\right.$ is by no means ein ganz farbloses Bild（Frankenberg）；we may safely assume that the משלים were conscious of the original meaning of（11，30； 30 13,$12 ; 15,4$ ）as well as of（10，11；13，14；14，27；16，22）just as modern German poets have not entirely forgotten the import of the term Jungbrunnen， although Toy，Comm．，p． 206 remarks，＂there seems to be no reason to suppose a reference to a primitive spring of life corresponding to the tree of life of Gen．2．＂For the tree of life and the spring of life（Assyr．namsu；cf．Crit．Notes on Ezekiel，p．64，1．27）in Oriental folklore see Meissner，Alexander und Gil－ gamos（Leipzig，1894），p．16；of．JAstrow，Rel．of Bab．and Assyr．，pp． 510.516. See also Schrader＇s KB 6，1，p．248，1．254；p．252，1．298．The plant of life is mentioned；apart from the Nimrod Epic，in the cuneiform historical texts，e．$g$ ． in an inscription of Esarhaddon（Beitr．2．Assyr．3，254，I1；cf．ibid．p．360）： 40 sarrûtu kîma sammi balaţi el̂̀ sîr niše liţt̂b＇may the kingdom be beneficial to the welfare（\％
 might be explained as distributive：every one of them will be made happy（cf． Ges．－Kautzsch $\S 145,1$ ）but in almost all analogous instances the text is doubt－ ful．Bick．emends $\mathfrak{A}$ ．
（21）An anintelligible；it is impossible to get from v． 20 a subject for I！．Probably the words were taken from 4,21 to fill out a text which had be－ come illegible（cf．English translation of Isaiah，p．209，1．35）．（6 víc，$\mu \eta$ ク $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha-$

St read בעיניך；but compare，on ©，Pinkuss．
（25）（cf．note on $\mathbf{1}, 4$ ）with OORT，TOY，in accordance with the parallelism；Al ロkภ甲；cf．below，p．40，1． 50.
[One of the three hemistichs of this verse must be omitted; Toy cancels the first, An שובו, or rather but it seems preferable to eliminate the third, אודיעה דברי אתכם, which appears to be an explanatory gloss to the second hemistich ,המה, and it would perhaps be best to transpose the first and second hemistichs, thus reading:-

(26) TM calamity ( $c f .1: 27 ; 6,15 ; 13,15 ; 24,22 ; 27,10$; for 17,5 sce p. 49,1,16) is identical with flood Gen. 2,6; Job 36,27 ; see Crit. Notes on Genesis, p. 118, 1. 3. For prie = sis see Crit. Notes on Judges, p. 59, 1. 6. - P. H.]
(27) $4 \mathrm{~K}^{\mathrm{e}} \mathrm{thib} \mathrm{B}$,
fit + hemistichs of the verse in $\mathrm{Al}_{\text {; }}$ apparently the words stood on the margin of the common archetype of $\mathfrak{f l l}$ and $\boldsymbol{6}$.

(30) [For $\gamma k \mathrm{cf}$. Crit. Notes on Ezekiel, p. 81, 1. 3.
 bop, like Job 15,32 is adjective, not verbal; the two hemistichs of the verse must be transposed: - ב. - P. H.]
 HAUSEN's translation of The Psalms, p. 169, 1. 36; $c f$. below, 13,22.

 from the $Q^{e} r e ̂$ with which $\$$ agrees? Both readings regard God as the
 the way of His saints. Yet v. 9 presupposes that we are to regard the saints

 lectionis was by accident not inserted; "שְ:? then became רשְ ? which led to the pointing iptor. [For 7צנ? ? see below, p. 52, 1. I\%. For the non-assimilation of the

 Assyrian, antedental $n$ is, as a rule, not assimilated in cases where the assimilation would produce ambiguity, e. g. ensu 'goat' in distinction from eazu 'strong,' enšu 'weak' in distinction from eššu ( $=$ cdš̌u, h. hads'u) 'new' \&c. See Hebraica $1,227$. V. $8^{\mathrm{b}}$ should be inserted after $7^{\text {a }}$ - P. H.]
(9) Tor thinks the rhythm might be improved by reading tben thou shalt keep instead of 3 M 4 .
(14) $\operatorname{Al}+\mathrm{yn}$ (so, too, (5Sd; DYS., GRÄTZ y?). This is a surprising pleonasm beside ת ת ; it is evidently repeated from $14^{2}$ and is, with OORT, to be struck out.
 are irooked; but the parallel ishows that the sinners are the subject. $6 \$$ and Toy try vainly to help the sense out by passing over the 2 in a
(17) [For חיר see above, p. 33, 1. 38. - P. H.] It would perhaps be better to read, with BICk, and Toy, for finc.
 masculine, and if we accent the last syllable (as perfect of שחה) the meaning


(19) For the first hemistich, of Hades (HAUPT, Nimr. Ep. 19,30): ana bitt sa cribušu la açit to the house 50 whence no one issues who has once entered it; Cf. JASTROw, Religion of Rabylonia and Assyria (Boston, 1898), p. 566; SChrader's KB 6, 1, p. 80, 1. 5; p. 188, 1. 30. (P. S. - See now Pelser in his OLZ 3,451). - P. H.]
of the third line consists merely of החימי (practically equivalent to Lift up! I say) while $\times \underset{\text { rind }}{4}$ represents the second hemistich. It is by no means necessary to suppose that a second hemistich (DUHm: השמיע' שלום) has dropped out, or that הנה אדעי should be transposed from the beginning of v. io (Marti). See the translation of the opening chapter of Deutero-Isaiah in No. 145 of the Johns Hopkins University Circulars, p. $39^{\text {b }}$. In the same way Job 31,35 constitute two separate clauses (or lines), and we need not insert, with Duhm, מי־יחן לי מנִלה; but פתב in the last clause of the verse should be corrected to בnכers, following $\$$ Dodas, 3 et librum scribat (cf. Budde's Comm., p. 184, below). The words on the Luther Monument in Worms, with which the Reformer io is said to have concluded his answer at the Diet on April 18 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ 1521, Hier stehe ich! Ich kann nicht anders!" Gott helfe mir! Amen, might form a tetrastich


 be preferable. The error may be due to the influence of v. $18^{\text {a }}(6 f .12,6)$. בצופנה לנקי חִנְם appears to be an explanatory gloss (Toy). - P. H.]

 certain occurrence of the fem. sing. נתיבה is Is, 43, 16.
V. 16 is omitted by $\operatorname{GSVP}$, Hitz., Now., Dys., Oort, Bick., Wild.; it is an evident gloss from Is. 59,7 . (GS c.age, BaUMG. support ant
(17) Toy thinks that we should perhaps read משושׂה רשת (which would require the
 ת. חתרשת is certainly wrong; v. 17 is a proverbial quotation. - P. H.]
(18) Wild. prefers to read
(19) Toy is inclined to read such is the fate \&c. instead of Al אnרוחת, but Gas ai dooí (cf. $\psi 1,6 \& c$.).
 read במַולה; yet in that case we would expect , (6 Tทั้ éautûv wuxi̊v.
(20) [Al ת and Crit. Notes on Ezekiel, p. 70, 1. 50; contrast Ges.-KaUtzsCh ${ }^{26}$ § 124 , e.
 ${ }_{n}$ iaqirna for jaqrima, \&c.); nor can it be an emphatic form of the 3 f sing. (=Arab. tarunnan); it might be explained as a form like Arab. tamudda for tamdud 35 (Wright-de Goeje ${ }^{3}$ I, § i2I), but, unless we read, with Heid. and Oort,

 this reading [so, too, OORT, Em. - P. H.] or to substitute as as in 8,2.
Al overcrowds and disturbs the hemistich; it is evidently an explanatory 40 gloss to בשגחו שערים. [Cf. Oort, Em. (see below, p. 69, 1. 1).
In the same way the following must be omitted as superfluous scribal expansion (so Toy); cf. below, p. 55, 1. 23.
(22) For At
 = שָׁאוֹה \&c. The name was pronounced it appears as Bit-sani (Assyr. $s=\psi$, cf. Crit. Notes on Ezekiel, p. 64, 1. 3r); see English translation of Joshua, p. 84, 1. 22. Cf. also below, p. 36, 1. 14.
Al ולֵלצים לצון חמדו לחם must be omitted, with Toy, as scribal expansion. - P. H.]

\& [It is hardly necessary to state that these first two clauses are not authentic; of. Ranke, Deulsche Gesch. im Zeitalter der Reform., 6th ed., vol. 1, p. 336. - P. H.]

Assyr. mislani, Arabic ,gbi, and that the term refers to the form (contrast above, p. 32, 1. 49); it means originally neither parable nor proterb \&c. but simply a line of poetry or verse, each stich consisting of two hemistichs. - (According to König, Stilistik (Bonn, 1900) p. 81, 1. 19 pְep means rvüun, sententia.)

For cuneiform proverbs see Halevy, Milanges de critique et d'histoire relatifs aux peuples sémitiques (Paris, 1883) pp. 326 ff . and JïGER's paper in Beitr. z. Assyr. 2, 274 ff , esp. p. 281 ; cf. note 20 to my lecture on The Book of Eiclesiastes (Boston, 1894). 1bid. n. 23 I have quoted a specimen of an Assyrian לִ̣p: - alu ša kakkašu dannu nakru ina pan abullisis ul ippatar "A city whose weapon is not strong -
The enemy will not be scattered in front of her gate."
The introductory verses at the beginning of the Book of Proverbs bear a certain resemblance to the opening lines of the Babylonian Nimrod Epic; see Beitr. 8. Assyr. 1,102; MÜrdter-Delitzsch, Geschichte Babyloniens und Assyriens (Calw, 1891), p. 47; A. Jeremias, İdubar-Nimrod (Leipzig, 1891), p. 14. It might be well to state in this connection that it is by no means certain that the ideographic name of the hero of the Babylonian epic is to be read Gilgames' (see Journal of the Amer. Orient. Soc., vol. 16, p. ix). Gilgames' may have been a surname like the appellation of the Babylonian Noah, Atra-zasis or Xasîs-atra (see l.c., p. cxi). To read the ideographic name of the hero of 20 the Babylonian epic Gitgames is about as reasonable as the idea that the name Richard I. should be pronounced Cour de Lion. Contrast KB 6, I, p. II6.
(8) I have pointed out in the Critical Notes on Chronicles, p. 80, 1.48 that Babylonian loanword $=t e r t u,{ }^{\alpha}$ the indication of the divine will from which the sacred oracle is derived, while Aram. یתחךְ and Ethiopic $\hat{\text { orit correspond to the }}$ byform of tertu: Artu. This artu has no connection with Heb. םu, as Zimmern suggests in his Beitr. zur bubyl. Religion, part 2 (Leipzig, 1899) p. 91, n. 2; ${ }^{\text {; }}$, the unfavorable, condemnatory answer of the oracle, is connected with 7 א to curse just as ullu, the cuneiform technical term for the unfavorable
 bind, just as arâru means not only to curse but also to bind (Drle, Hch. Lang., p. 53 ; HW $70^{\mathrm{b}} \cdot 138^{\mathrm{a}}$ ), or as 21,9 ) and enchantment. The technical name for the favorable answer, Heb. - pp, blamelessness, acquittal is, in the cuneiform texts, annu, lit. response, cf. Heb. Hy (see below, note on 15,28); a connection with anna 'this' and Heb. (Zimmern, l. c., p. 88, n. 4) is not probable. The name of the Babyionian
 Is. 47,13 , as Zimmern suggests (l. c. p. 85, n. 8 ) but we find it in Is. 44,25;
 stract of my paper on The Origin of the Mosaic Ceremonial in No. 145 of the Johns Hopkins C'iniversity Circulars (May, 1900) p. $37^{3}$ and my paper on liabyIonian Elements in the Leritic Ritual in vol. 19 of the Journal of Biblical Liter. ature (Boston, 1900) p. 58; cf. Crit. Notes on Ezra-Nehemiah, p. 60, 1. 15 .
(Io) $\times 2$ nench solemnly pronounced, is a full hemistich. Toy, Comm., p. 19, remarks that this clause may be purposely short. Similarly the brevity of the first hemistich in $23,35^{\text {c }}$, , טתי את את אקיץ there is is a pause, practically equivalent to our modern dash ( - ; ; it is unnecessary to insert, with BICK. and ToY, מִינִי (Gien. 9, 24). For this intentional brevity of certain hemistichs see Crit. Notes on Isaiah, p. 172, 1. I; cf. also Is. 40,9 , where the first hemistich 50
 1. 23; p. 58, 1. 7; Crit. Notes on Isaiah, p. 88, 1. 38. - P. H.]

Prov.

MÜhlau, H. F., De proverbiorum quae dicuntur. Aguri et Lemuelis origine atque indole, Lipsiae, 1869.

Now. = W. Nowack, Die Sprüche Salomo's (in Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Hanabuch zum $A T$ ), Leipzig, 1883.

OORT $=$ H. OORT, Spreuken $1-9$, in Theol. Tijdschrift, Leyden, 1885, pp. 5 379 ff .

Pink. $=$ H. Pinkuss, Die syrische Ubersetzung der Proverbien textkritisch und in ihrem Verhältnisse zu dem masoretischen Text, den $L X X$ und dem Targum untersucht; in ZAT 14 (1894).

Strack, Die Sprüche Salomos, second edition, Nördlingen, 1899 (in Strack's io and Zöckler's Kurzgefasster Kommentar zu den Heiligen Schriften des $A$ und $N T$.

Toy $=$ C. H. Tov, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Book of Proverbs, New York and Edinburgh, 1899, in The International Critical Commentary.

Vogel = A. Schultensil Versio integra Proverbiorum Salomonis et in eadem Commentarius, quem in compendium redegit et obsenvationibus critacis auxit Geo. Jo. Ludov. Vogel, Halis, 1768.

Wild. = G. Wildeboer, Die Sprüche, in Karl Marti's Kurzer HandCommentar zum AT, Freiburg i. B., 1897 (cf. also Wildeboer, De Tijdbepaling 20 van het Boek der Spreuken in Verslagen en Mededeelingen der Koninkl. Akad. van Wetenschapen (Afd. Letterkunde, 4. Reeks, deel iii) Amsterdam, 1899, pp. 233-255.


(4) [For Al Mittheil. 3,29, n. 1; JÄGER, Beitr. z. Assyr. 1,489.
(6) The Hebrew term consisting of two parallel halves or hemistichs; cf. Assyr. mistu 'half' (Arab.
 in the middle. Like Arabic $\underset{\sim}{\text { un }}$ cuneiform poetry is generally arranged in two parallel columns, each line consisting of two hemistichs, as the Song of Moses in Deut. 32 appears in the current editions of $\mathfrak{A l}$; $f$. SCHRADER, Die Höllenfahrt der Istar (Giessen, 1874) p. 60; HAUPT, Akkad. Sprache (Berlin, 1883) p. 25 and pp. xxxv.xxxvi below; Zimmern, Babyl. Busspsalmen (Leipzig, 1885); Beitr. zur Kenntniss der Babyl. Religion, Part I (Leipzig, 1896) p. 53; ZA 8,121;10,1;11,86;12,382; DELITZSCH, Das babyl. Weltschöpfungsepos 40 (Leipzig, 1896), pp. 6 and 60 ff., especially pp. 100 ff. and pp. 92 ff.; GUNKEL, Schöpfung und Chaos (Göttingen, 1895) pp. ix and $401 \mathrm{ff}$. ; Cheyne, Crit. Notes on Isaiah, p. 78, 1. 24.

BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS' Lex. translates proverb, parable but adds in parenthesis: - "of sentences constructed in parallelism, usually of Hebrew wisdom, but occasionally of other types;" and Toy states in his Commentary on Proverbs, p. 3: - "The Hebrew word טָׁטֶל (proverb) probably signifies similarity, parallelism (nearly $=$ comparison), and seems to have been used at an early time of all poetry, hardly with reference to the form (parallelism of clauses, clause-rhythm, being the distinctive formal characteristic of old-Semitic poetry), but, probably, with reference to the thought (short distichs made by the juxtaposition of related ideas, originally comparisons with familiar objects." I be-



## Eritical Moter on (proverBg

IIE PRINCIPAL commentaries and critical notes on the Book of Proverbs are referred to in the present notes under the following abbreviations: -

BAUMG. = A. J. BaUmgartner, Étude critique sur l'élat du lexte du livre des Proverbes d'apris les principales traductions anciennes, Leipzig, 1890.

Berth. = E. Bertheau, Die Sprïche Salomo's (in Kiurzgefusstes Exegetisches Handbuch sum AT), Leipzig, 1847.

Bick. $=\mathrm{G}$. Bickell, Kritische Bearbeitung der Proverbien, in 10 the Vienna Oriental Journal, vol. 5 (1891), pp. 86 ff .

Chajes $=$ H. P. Chajes, Promerbia-Studien su der sogenannten Salomonischen Sammlung C. $x$-xxii, 16 , Berlin, 1899.

Del. $=$ Franz Delitzsch, Das Salomonische Spruchbuch, in Kell und Delitzsch, Bibl. Commentar über das AT, Leipzig, 1873.

Dys. $=$ JOH. DYSERINCK, Kritische Scholien bij de vertaling van het bock der Spreuken, in Theol. Tijdschrift, Leyden, 1883.

Ew. $=$ H. Ewald, Die Dichter des Alten Bundes, part 2, second edition, Göttingen, 1867.

Frank. $=$ W. Frankenberg, Die Sprïche übersetzt und erklürt in W. No- 20 wack's Handkommentar sum AT, Göttingen, 1898.

Grätz = H. Grätz, Exegetische Studien au den Salomonischen Sprüchen, in Monatsschrift fiir Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums, 1884, pp. 289ff.; 337 ff ; ; 414 ff ; 433 ff . Cf. GräTz's critical notes on Proverbs in the second part of his Emendationes, Breslau, 1893, pp. 30-33 (covers cc. 1-22).

Heit) $=$ M. Heidenheim, Zur Texthritik der Proverbien, in Dewtsche lierter. jahrsschrift fïr englisch-theologische Forschung und Kritik, 2 (Gotha, 1865), pp. 395 ff.; 3 (Zürich, 1867), 51 ff., und 327 ff . (covers cc. 1-9).

Hitz. = F. Hitizig, Die Spriiche Salomos iibersetst und ausgrelegt, Zürich, 1858.
JÄG. = J. G. JÄGER, Observationes in Proverbiorum Salomonis versionem 30 Alexandrinam, Meldorpii et Lipsiae, 1788.

Kamph. $=\mathrm{A}$. Kamphausen, Übersetzung der Sprïche in Kautzsch's AT (second edition, Freiburg, 1896) pp. $78+\mathrm{ff}$., with brief critical notes on the text in the Beilagen, pp. 81 ff.

Lag. $=$ P. ne Lagarde, Anmerkungen aur grieihisihen ibersetaung der 35 Proverbien, Leipzig, 1863.
 6 תנו שֵׁכר לאובד ויון למרי נפש:
ועמלו לא יזכר עוד: אל דין כל בני חלוףח: ודין עעי ואביון: 7 8 פְתח פיך לאּאֵּם 9 פּתח פּד שמט צדק

ורחק מפנינים מכרה: ושלל לה יחסר : בל ימי חידֶה:
ותעש בחֵפּ כפּדֶ: ממסֵרחק תביא לחמּחּ: ותחתן טרן לביתהם : מפרי כפּיָּ נטעםהם כרם: ותאֵּץ זרועתידֶ:
לא יכבה בַַּיל נַרה: וכוּדָה תמבו פלך: וידיָּ שלחה לאביון: בי כל ביתהּ לבשׁ שגִּם:

ששׁ וארגמן לבושה: בשבתי עם וקני ארץ:
ותגור נתנה לכבַעני:
ותשחק ליום צתרון: ותורת חסד על לשונחה: ולחם עצלות לה תאכל: ויהתללח בעלחי ואמחּ עלית על קּלנה: הצשה יראת ידוה היא תחתהלל: ויחֵללודָה בשערים מעשׁהֶ:
 11
1213 12 מלתחהו עוב ולה רע 13 דרשדה צמר ופשתים 14 היתה באֵניות סוחר םו ויתקם בעוד ליליה 1619 ממה שרדה ותקחדה 7\% 8 וע עמה בי טוב סחרהּ


ב בעדח פרשוֹה לעני
 22 23 נודע בשערים בעלה. 24 סרין עשלתה ותמכר

פהע עו והדר לבושה 26 פּיֶּ פתחה בחבמה 27 28 Pמו בניֶָ ויצֵשרוָה 29 רבות בנות עשו חיל
 31 ת תנו לה מפרי ידיהֶ



וטצצחתו לא יחקץ:

ומאכלות מתַלעת

$2 \pi 2 \pi$
ארבע לא אמרו דון: ロクา * * * * * * ואש לה אמרה הון:

ותבו ליקאת אם ויאכלוהָ בני נשר:
וארבעםהּ לא ידעת דרד נחש עלי צור ודרך גבר בעלמה:B

ותחת ארבע לא תובל שאׁת: ונבל כי ישבע לחם:
ושפחה כי תירש גברתה:
ודהמה חבמים מחפמים: ויכינו בקיץץ לחמם: וישׁימו בספּלע ביתם:
 והיא בהיפלי מלך:

וֹארבעה מַטִבי לכת: ולא ישוב מפני כל: :... ...... ומל

30,12 דור טהור בעיניו 34 דור מה רמו עיניו
14 דור תרבות שנּיו לאבל עניים מארץ שו לעלוקה שמּ בגות
שלוש הנה לא תשבענה

* 16 ארץ לה שבעה מים

17 יקרוּהֶה ערבי בחל
18 שלדשה המה נמלאו טמצי 9 19 דוך הנשר בשמַים דרך אנִּיה בלב ים
21 תחת שלוש רגזה ארץ 23 תחת עבד פי ימלוך 23 תחת שנואה כי תבעל

24 ארבעה הם קטני ארץ פה הגמלים עם לא עו 26 שפִנים עם לאת עצום
 28 שְׁממית בידים תחתםש 29 שלששה המה מיטִבי צעד ל לַיש נבור בבהּמה
וּ זורזויר מתנֵּם אוּ תֶּ

ואם ומותָ יד לםם: 33 בי מיץ חלב ייציא חמאה ומיץ אף יוציא דםצ:

## cegne

31,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ב מה ברי מה למואל בכורי אמר אליך } \\
& \text { ומה בר בטני הוּ ומה בר נדרי: } \\
& 3
\end{aligned}
$$

וחכמים ישיבו אף: ורגו ושוֹחק ואין נחת:
 וחכם באחור ישׁׁבחתּה:

על משׁׁרתיו רשעים: מַאיר עעיני שניהם יהוה: כסאו לעד יפּון:
 וצדּיקים במפַּלתם יראו: ויתן מעדנים לנפשך:

וֹשׁמר תורה אשׁרהו:
בי יבין ואין מענה: תקוה לכםיל ממנו: וצחריתו יהיה מדאון: ובעֶל חַמה רב פשע: וֹשִׁפל רוח יתמך כבוד:
 ובוטח ביהוה ישׁׁגב: ועיהוה משפט איש: ותועבת רשע ,"שר דרך:

29,8 אמששי לצון יפיחו קריה


1
12 טששל מקשיב על דבר שקר 13 רש ואיש ואיש תכבים נפגשו 14 מלך שופט באמת דלים
 16 ברבות רשעים ירבה פשע 17 יֵּר בנך ויעיחף

18 באין חהון יפרע עם 19 כ חויתֶ אישׁ אֵ בדבריו

21

23 גבוּות אדם תשמילמוּ
24 חולק עם גנְב שוֹנה נםשוֹ
בה הֶרדחת אדם יחן טוקש 26 רבּים מבבקשים פני מושל 27 תועבת צדיקים אישׁ עָול

 ולא בינת אדם לי: ודעת קדשׁים אֲדע: מי אסף רוח בתפניו מי הי המ ומה שם בנגם: מגֵן הוא לחוטים בו: פן יוכיח בך ונמבּבָּ:

אל תמנע משני בטרם אמות: ראש ועשׁר אל תחן ליצ:

ואמרתי עי יהוה ותפשׂתי שם אלהי:

פן יקַללך ואשמת: ואת אםו לה יבָרך:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { א30, } \\
& \text { 2 בי בער אנבי מַאיש } \\
& 3 \\
& 4 \text { מי עלה שִׁים וּיַבּד } \\
& \text { מי צרר טים בִשְׂמלה } \\
& \text { מה שמו } \\
& \text { ה כל צִּמְרת האלודה צרופה } \\
& 6 \text { אל תּוֹקו: על דבריו } \\
& \text { 7 שתַּים שאלתי מאחך }
\end{aligned}
$$

ותאn ומאספו עשצבות דרים: ומחיר שרדה עתודים: וחויים לנערותיך:
: וֹחั
 מטו וֹשׁמרי תורה יתבְּרו בם: ומבַקשׁי יהוה יבינו כל: טַעִקשׁ דרנבֵּם והוא עשיר: ורעה זוללים יבלים אביו: לחונן דלים 'קָבצנּו: גם תפְּתו תועֶבה: בשחותו הוה 'פולזי: ודל טבין יחקרנו: ובקום רשעים יחקששוֹ אדם:

ומודה ועוֹב ירְחם: וַַקשׁה לבוּ יפוֹל ברעה: מושׁל רשע על עם דרל: שנגאם בָצע יאריך ימים:

צעד בור ינום אל יתמבו בוּ: ונעקש דרנט ומרֵדף ריקים ישׁבע ריש: ואיק להעשיר לא יצקה:

ועל פח לחם יפשע גבר:
 ממחליק לשון [אחריצ"]]: חהבר הוא לאיש משחית: ובטח על יהוה ידשׁן: והולך בחבמה הוא ״םלט:


 ובטשל רששע יֵאמח עם: ורעה וונות יאֵבד דון: ואישׁ תרומות יֶהרסנה: רשת פורש על פעמיוּ
 רשע לא וּין דעת:

27,24
 26 27

28,k בסו ואין לדף רשע:[ם] 28 3 4 4ובי תורה ״הללו רשע
ה אנשי רע לא יב יבינו טשםט
6 טוב רש הולך בתהּ
7 נוצר תורה בן מבין
8 מרבה הונו בנשך קובּתרבית 9 טַטיר אזנו משמע תור תורה - טַשִּנה ישרים בדרך רע
 12 בעלץץ צדיקים רבה תפארת 13 מבַםה פשעיו לא יצליח 14
 16 [מעשׁקית]

וא אדם עוֹשק בדם נסשׁ
 9 עבר אדמתו ישבע לחם ברו ב אישׁ אמונות ר ברכות

21 הפרר פנים לא טוב
22 נבהל להון היש רע עו
23
24
כה רחב נפש יצרדה פדון
26
27 בותן לרֶש אין מחסור 28

29,
2
3
4
ה גבר מחליק על רעֵהו
6
7
NN
28,2 ( $\beta$ )
7ハリ

נלהה להשיבה אל פעים משבעה משיבי טעם: מתעבם על ריב לא לו:
 ואמר הלא משׁחק אני:



והם ירדו חדרי בטן:


ובקרבוּ ישית שִוְמה: כי שבע תועבות בלהו:

תגּלה רעתו בקהל: וגלל אבן אליי תשוב: ופה חלק יעשה טִדֶחתה: כי לא תֵדע מה יֵּלד יום: נכרי ואל שפתיץ: וכַעם אויל כבֵד משוניהם: ומי יעמד לפני קנִאה: מַאהבה מסקתרת:
 ונמשׁ רעַבה כל מר מתוק: בן
 ובית אחס תבוא ביום אידך מַאח רחוֹק:

ואשיבה חרפי דבר: פתֶאים עברו נענשו: ובעד נכרים חבלֵהו:

קזלֹה תֵחשב לו:

 ושושמר אדניו יקבּד ***:

בן לב האדם לאדם: ועיני האדם לא תשבענה: ואיש לם מהללחו: לא תסורקּא אוּלתתו:

שית לבּ לעדרים:

| 26,10 טמן עצבּל ידו בצלתהת 16 <br> 17 מחויק בהמונוֹ, כלב עבו |
| :---: |
|  |
|  |
|  |
| 21 22 דברי נרגו כמתלהמים |
| 23 24 בשׂפתּםם ינכר שונא כה בי יחֵנן קולו אל תאהן בו |
| 26 27 פלרה שַׁחת בהּ יפוּל |
| 28 לשון שקר ישנז |
| «27, |
| ותהילך זר ולא טיד |
| פַבד אבן ונטֵל החול |
|  |
| טובה תוכַת מגלּה |
| נאמנים פצע אוהב |
|  |
| בצורור בודדת |
| שמן וקטֹרת ישֵׁמח לב |
| רעך ובעם אביך אל תעזב |
| טוב שֶן קרוב |
|  |
| 12 12 ערום ראה רעה נסתר |
|  |
|  |
| טוּ דֵּרף טורד ביום סגריד |
|  |
|  |
| 18 ניצר תצֵנה יאכל פריה |
| 9 19 \% . . |
|  |
| 212 |
| 2 |
| [תרים1) |
|  |

23 ירע תַדע פני צאנך


ואם צמפּ השׁקדוּת
וידוּה



：צוּ צּ ：וּ
 ： ：xבת ה וֹשׁロ




 ועשל בפי כםילים：בעי ：［］ כםיל שונה באוּלתו：


וא ועצֵ
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24
 26

27 :
 29

ל 31 32 33 34


2 3 שטַים לרום וארץ לעמק ולב מלכים אין חֵקר:

$$
4 \text { ה דָגו סיגע לפצים מכם מלך }
$$

6 אל תחתהדר לפני מלך ובר למקום גללים אל תעמד: 7 כי טוב אמר לך עלֵה הנה מהששםילך לפני נדיבץ:

 למי חכלילות עענים：
לבאים לחקור טִמסךך：

אחריתו כנחש ישךך ולבּך ידֶבר תהקדבות：


הלמוני בל ידעתי אוסיף הבבקשנוּ עוד：
 ועעמל שטתיהם תרַברנה：

ובתבונה יתכונן： כל זון יקר וגעים：

23，26 גזנה בני לבּד לי
27 28

29 למי אוי למי צמבו＂ למי פצעים חקֶם לם לם
ל למאֵחרים על הי״ן

32 ${ }^{2}$ יתהלך במישרים 33 34 והייתֶ בלוֹכב בלע ים לה הפוּי בל חליתי טתֵי אקיץ

24，＊אל תקגנא באנשי רעה 2

3 בחכטה יבנה בית 4 ובדעת חדרים יםלאי
：ก่ భ＂ ：ヶッท בשער לא לפתח פיההו： לו בעל טוְמות יקראו： ותועבת לאדם ללץ：

ביום צרה צר לחכה：
ומטים לדֶרג אם החששוֹך ： הלא תכן לפוּת הוא יבין והשיב לאדם כפעֵלו：

ולפת לתוק על חִפך ： חכמה לנפשך

6 פי בתחבּלות תעשה לך מלחמה
7 7ראמות：לאیויל חכמות
8

＊＊＊＊＊
11 הצֵּל לקאחים למות 12 בי תאממר הן לא ידענו וה וצצר נפשך הוא יצע

13 אֲכל בני דבֵש כי טוב

טו אל תארב ורשע לעו לנוהה צדיק 16 כי שָׁבע יפול צדיק וקם

17 בנטל אויבם אל תששמח
18 פן צראה יהוה ורע בעיציו
19
כ כי לא תהּה אחרית לרע

> השר עשוֹ הבותיך:
> 28 האל תסֵּ גבול עולם

40

29 חזיָת אישׁ מהיר במלאכתו ßבל יתיצב לפני חשֻּׁים:
א23, בי תַשב ללחום הת מושל בין בין תבין את אמשר לפמניך: אם בעל נפש אתחה:

4 ה זכי יעלעם

ת



9 באוני כםיל אל תדַבר בי יבוֹ לשׁבל מליך(8):
ובשד"י יתומים אל תבא: הוּא יריב את ריבם אתךך:

ואוגך לאמרי דעת:
כי תַכּנו בשׁׁבט לֹא ימות :
וצפשו משאול תציל:
ישמוח לבּי גם אמני: בדַבר שׂפתיך טישרים:

כי אם ביראת ידוה כל היום: ותקוּתך לא תפרת:
, בי גיאלם חוק

12 הביאה למוסר לבך

|  וצפשו משאול תביל: |
| :---: |
| ישמוח לבּי גם אני: בדַבר שׂפתיך מישרים: |

13 אוֹ תמגע מנֵּער מופר 14 אתה בשבט תַּפּ 14 טו בני אם חכם לבּ 16 ותעלזונה כלִיותם

17 אל 18 כי אם >ת

וצעשר בדוך לבגד:
בוֹלי בשוֹר למו: וקרעים תלביש נומה:

ותאל תבוז בי זקנה אםמך:
חבמה ומוסר ובינה:
ותֶגֵל יולדתך:
號

19 שְׁמע אתמה בני וחכם
ב אל תהּ בסבאי יין
21
22 שְׁמע לאביך זוה ילדך

$$
23 \text { אמתת קְנֵה וֹאל תמכר }
$$

כה ישממח אביך ואםך

$$
24
$$

בצי 29 ( 29 (
22,27 ( $\alpha$ )
1 $23.3^{\text {a }}$ ( (\%)

| ואין עצדה לנבד יהוה： וליהוה התשועה： | 21，ל מי3 טום מוכן ליום טלחמהּ |
| :---: | :---: |
| טכםף ומזהב חן טוב： עעשׁה קְּם יהוה： |  2 |
| ופתֶיים עברו ונענשו： עשׁר וכבוד וחיים： | 3 4 |
|  | ש\％\％ 7 \％ |
|  | 6 |
| ועבד לוד לאהיש טלודוה： ושׁׁבט עברתו יהכלהּוּ עי נתן מלחמו לדל： | לושׁ 7納 8 9 |
|  |  |
| שׂפתיו קר ויסֵלף דברי בגד： | ב而＊＊＊＊＊＊＊ 12 עיני ידוה בצרו דעת |
| ：กรา | ץィッ |
| ： | ט 14 |
|  נֹתן לעשיר אך למתםור： | טו אוּלֶת קשוֹרה בלב נער 6ו עשק דל להרבות לו |









22 ： 23

וצ וֹ ולקחקח מוקש לנפשׁ ：


 ב עבחר ליהוה צובח：
：クงセู่ ח
：

 ועד



ובהשציל לחכם יקח דעת：
טֵֵלף רשעים לרע：
： ：
： בקהל רפהאים יצוח：
：צהּ
ותחת יששרים בוגד： מהאשת מדק ：וコリング ロール゙ ：
： שׁׁ
：


：18゙ロッ •

3 4 רום עינַים ורחַב לב

ה מחשבות זרוץ אך למותר
6 פעעל הצרורות בלשון שקר 7
8 9
 － 12 משוֹביל צֶּיק לבית רשע
 ぞ Mロゴ
 16

17 א 17 מישׁ מחסור


 21

22 עיר גבּרים עלה חבם 23 ששמר פיו ולשׁועו

24

כה תאֹות עצֵּ תמשת 26

7ゴッ ロ 29

 2 בֵּהם בכפּר אימת מלך מתעברו חוטא נפשו: 3 כבוד להיש שבת פֵיב וכל אויל יתגלע:

4 מתרףף עצֵל לה יחרשׁ בוּשאל בקציר ואצין:
ז מים עמקקים עִצדו בלב איש ואיש תבונה ידלגה:
6 רב אדם ימקראی איש חסדם ואיש אמונים מי ימצא:
אשׁרי בניו אחריו:
טֶדָהּ בעיניו כל רע: טהרתי פחּחצתי: תועבת יהוה גם שניהם: אם וך ואם ישר קרוכא:

יהוה עשה גם שגיהם: קְח עיניך שִבע לחם: ואוּל לו או יתהלל:

וכלי יקר שםתת דעת: ובעד נכריֹים חבֵּוֹהו: ואתר ימלא שידו חחקצץ: ובתחקּלות עשה מלחמה:

ולפחתה שפתיו לא תתעדב:
 ואחריתח לא תברך:

קוּה ליהוה וישֶׁע לך: ומאהני מרמה לא טוב: ואדם מה יבין דרכו: ואחר בדרים לבֵקר: צישֵׁב עליהם אומן: חמשש כל חדרי בטן: וסעד בחסד כסאו:

וחדר וקגים ש'יבה:
ומפּות חדרי בטן:

7 מתהתלך בתחפו צדּיק
8 מלך יושב על בפּא רין
9 9 מצ יאמר זפיתי לבי

- אבן ואבן א׳פה ואיפה 1י גם במעלליי יתנכר בער
 13 אל תאהב שִׁנה פן תּוּרשׁ

1414 רע רע יאמר הקונה
טו ישו זוהב ורב פנינים 16
17 ערב לאיש לחם שקר
18 מחשבות בעֵּדה תפּן
19 נולה סוד הולך רביל ב מקלל אביו ואמו 2121

22 האל תאמר השֵׁלמה רע
23 תועבת יהוה אבן ואבן
24 מיהוה מִצְעדי גבר
בהה :טוקש אדם ילע קדשש
26 מןרדה רשעים מלך חכם 27 נר יהוה נִשִׁמת אדםם 28 חסד ואמת יצרו מלך

29 ל חקברות קָצע תוּמריק ברע
2 גם בלא דעת נפשל לאו טוב ואیץ ברגלַים חוטאו:
3 אוּלֶּת אדם תסֵלף דרכו ועל יהוה יחעף לבּו:
4 דון יסטף רַעים רבּים ודל מרעהו יפרד:

6 רבּים יחַלו פני נדיב וכיב הר לוֹע לאיש מתן:

מרַדף אמרים ילא המדו:
ששמר תבונה ולמעצה טוב:

" לא נאוֶה לכםיל תענוג אף בי לעבד משׁל בשׂרים:
 21 נַהם בכפיר וַעף מלך וכטל על עִשב רצונוּ:
 14 בית והון נחלת אבות צמית ימיהוה האשה משכלת:

טו עצלה תפיל תרדֵּמה ונפש רמִּה תרעב: 16 17 מלוֵה יחוה דונן דל וגְׁלו ישֵׁלם לו: 8 ו יֵטר בנך כי יש תקוה
 ב שְׁמע עֵּצה וקַבל מוסר למען תחכם באחריתך: 12 רבוּת מחשבות בלב טיש ועצת יהוה היא תקום:

22 תוֹהות הדם חסדו וטוב רש מהיש צזב:
ושבובע ילין בל יפקד רע:
גם אל פיהו לא ישיבנה: והופיח לנבון יבין דעת:

בן מַביש ומחפּרו: לשגות מַאמרי דעת:
 ומהלשות לגֵו בסילים:

23 יראת יהוה לחיים
24 טמן עצצל ידו בצלּחת כה לֵץ תפה ומתי יערם
 27 חקדל בני לישמוֹע מוסר 28 בֵד בליבעל ילייץ משפט 29 נכונו ללֵּצים שיבזטים

ועיני כסיל בקצה ארץץ: ומֶמר ליולדתו:

לדפות מדיבים עלי יםתר:

וקר רוח הישׁ תבונה: אלטם שפתיו נבון: בכל תוֹשִּה יתגלע: צי אם בהתגלות לבו: ועם קלון תרפה:

נחל ذבע מקור חתבמה:
להטות צדיק במשפט:
ופעיו למהלְמוּת יקרא: ושפפתיו מוקש נפשו: והם ירדו חודרי בטן:

אח דוא לבעל משחית:
בו ירוּק צדייק ונשצב: וכחומה נשׂגבה במשכִּחו:

ולפעי כבוד ענָּוה:


ורוח נבֵה עי עי ישאּנה: ואוּ חבמים תבִקש דעת: ולצני גדלים יֵגָחנו: (2וּ ובין עצומים יפריד:
! . . . . . . כבריח ארמון:
תבואת שפתרי ישבע: וארה

יעָּק רֶצוּן טיהוה: ועשיר יענה עאת: ויש אהב דבק מֵאח:

17,24 את פני טבין חכמה כה כעם לאביו בן כםיל

26 גם עענוש לצדיק לא טוב
27 חושלך צמריו יודע דעת 28
 2 ל לא יחפק כסיל בתבונה

3
4
ד שה שת פני רשע לא טוב
6 שצׁתי כסיל יבאו בריב 7 פי פסיל מחֵתה לו 8 דברי נִרגְּן כמתלהמים

9

- עגדל עו שם יהוה晎

12 לפני שבר ינבח לב לם צישׁ 13 משיב דבר בשרם ישמע
 טו לב עבון יקנה דעת

16 17 צודיק הראשון בריבו
18 מֶךינים ישבית דגורל
iy ת
ב מפרי פי איש תשבע בטנו
21 בוחת וחיים ביד לשון
22 23 תחנונים ידֶבר רשׁ 24

> בדרך צדקדה תפםצא: ומשל ברוחו מלכד עיר: ומיהוה כל עשפטו:
> ממַּית מלֵה זבחי ריב: ובתוך אהחים יחלק נחלה:
> ולחן לבּות יהוה:
> שקר מזין על לשון הּתח:

> ותפפָּרח בנים אבותם:
> אףף בי לנדיב שפחת שקר:
> אל בל הששר יפנה ישניל:
> וֹשוֹה בדבר מפריד אלוּו:
> מֵהפוּת בטיל מאה: ומלאך אבורי ישׁׁלח בוּ: ואל כמסיל באוּלתו: לא תמיש רעה טביתו: ולפני התגלע תריב נטוש: תועבת יהוה גם שניחם:

לקנות חבמה ולב איץ:
ואה לצרה יוּלד:
ערב ערבּה לפני רצֵהו:
מגביהּ שִּתחּו מבּקשׁ שבר: ונהפך בלשׁונו יצול ברעה:

ולה ישמח אבי נבל: זרוח נכֵאה תַּבש גרם:

להשוות ארחות משפט:

32 טוב אֶרך אֵּׁם טמבּור
33 בחיק יוטל את הגורל

2 עבד משכיל יטשל בבן טביש
3 טַּצֵרף לכםף וכור לזהב

ה לעע לרש חַרף עשׁׁהו
6 עעמרת וקַנים בני בנים
7 לא נאוה לנבלי שפת יתר
8 אבן חן השחד בעיני בעליו
9 מכֵסה פֶׁשע מבֵקש אהבה תחתּת גצגרה במַּין
II וּ, .. ערי יבֶקש רע
12 פנוש רלב שפּול באיש
13 משיב רעה תחת טובה
14 מוּמר עים רהשת מדון שו מצדיק רשע ומרשיע צדיק

16 למה זה מחיר ביד כסיל
17 בכל עת האב הרע
18 אדם חסר לב הֹקע כף
19 אוֹדב טַּשע אוֹהב מצדה
ב עישׁ לב לא ימצה טוב
I2 ילד בסיל סתוגה לו

23 שׁחד מחק רשע יקח
：ロצy ต ต
עקרב ועשומע עั וּ ולפมּ

ומיהוה טעענֵה לשען：
 ：
 ：וּアジ バ ובירא ת
 ：מרע

： מעשׁהT ：אอบ ן ：コTぶ ：וֹリา ורצונו בעב מלקוש：





ובומח ביחוה אשריו：


וער
： ：טחּ ואחריתחּ דרכי טות：

2
 וּ וֶרֶ
 ：קר

2）
 32 33

3） 2
 4
ה ה ה

7
8 9
 ה 11 12 13 14 חומחת מלך מלאהכי מות


16

17 18



22
23
םy） 24

if Thay hoy exa 26
 28 ル תוכקדת

למען סור משאול משה:

: ロy่ (

:
ות ותּ

15,4 מרפֵּא לשון עץ חים
ה הויל ינהץ מוסר אביו
6 בית צדיק חסן 27


8 וְבח רשעים תועבת יהוה 9 תועבת יהוה דרך רשע

- מוסר רע לעוֹב האח 11 שאול ואבֵדון נגד יהוה

12 לה יאהב לץ הוכֵח לו אל חכמים לה ילך: 13 לב שׂמַח י"טִב פנים ובעצבת לב רחה נכאה:

ופם" כםילים ירעה אהֵּלת:
וטוב לב משתה תמיד:
טֵאוצר רר ומהומה בו:
משור אבום ושגאה בו:
וֹאָרך אפַּים ישקים ריב: וארח ישרים סללה:

וכסיל אדם בוזה אמו: ואיש תבונה ייישר לכת:

וברב יעעצים תקום: ודבר בעתה מה טוב:

22 הפּר טחשבות באּן סוֹד 23 שׂמחה לאיש במענֵה פיו

24 צירח חיים למעלה למשצביל
כה בית גֵּאים יםח יהוה 26 תועבת יהוה מחשבות רע

27 עצר ביתו בוצע בצע
28 לב צדּיק יהגה לענות 29 רחוֹק יהוה מֵּשעים

|  | ואהל ישרים "יסריד: | 14,11 בית רשעים רצמד |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ואחריתח דרכי מות: | 122 |
| 5 | ואתרית\% שמחה תוּ | 13 13 בם בוֹחק יצ2 |
|  |  | 14 טדרכיו ישבע טוג ל-2 |
| 10 | וערום יבין לאצשרו: וכםיל מתעבר ובוטח: | טו טתם יאמין לכל דבר 72 16 חכם ירא וסר טַרע לע |
|  | וציצ טוּמות ישגא: וערומים יכתּרו דעת: |  18 בותלו פתֶהים אֵּלֵת |
| 15 | ורשעים על שערי צדיק: | 19 שׁׁחו רעים לפני טובים |
|  | ואהדבי עשיר רבּםם ומחונן עִיגּ | ב בם לרעהו ישנה רש רש 21 |
| 20 | וחסד ואטת דרשי טוב: | 22 |
|  | ודבר שׂמתֵים אֹר למחור: | 23 בכל עצב יהיה טותר |
|  | : |  |
| 25 | ויפִח כובים ימרמהו: | צד טציל נפשות |
|  | ולבניו ידיה מחסד: לסור ממקששי מות: | 26 27 יראת יהוה מקור חיּם |
| 30 |  | 28 בר2 עם הדרת מלך |
| 35 |  ורקב עעצמות קִנֵאה: ומקַבדו חרנֶ, אבְיון: וחסה בּ ב וּברב כםילים תוְדע: | 29 אֶר אפּ <br>  <br>  32 33 בלב נבון תגוח חכמהה |
| 40 |  ועברתו ותהיהּ טֵביש: | 34 לה רצון מלך לעבד טששכיל |
|  | ודבר עצב יעלה אֵף: <br>  צ'סות רעים וטובים: | 15, לשון חבמים תיטיב דעת 3 בכל מקום עיני יהוד רה |


14 תורת חכם מקור חיםם לסור מגוקשי מות：

 17 מלאך רשע יפּדל ברע וציר אמונים מרפֵּא：

18 ריש וקלון פורע מוסר וֹשוּמר תוכַתה יבּבּד：

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ותועבת כםילים מור מֵרע: }
\end{aligned}
$$

22 טוב ינחיל בני בנים וצפון לצדייק חיל חוטא：

> 24 חושלך שבטו שוֹנה בנו והאהבו ששחרו מוסר:
> כה צדייק אֹכל לשׁבעע נפשוּ ובטן רשעים תחסר:

> 4 באין אלפים אצבום בר ורב תבואות בלח שזר:
> ה צֵד אמונים לה יכַּב ויפּח מבים עֵד שקר:
> 6 בקשׁ לִ חכמה ואין ודעת לנבון נקל:

> ובין ישרים רצון: .................. 9
> , לב יודע טָּת נפשו ובשמותתו לא יתערב זר:


 18 ישׁ בוטה כמדקרוח חרב ולשוֹן חכמים מרפֵּה:


ב צִרךה בלב חרשׁ רע , וליעצי שלום שִׁמחהד:




24

26

28 באֹרח צֶדקה חוים ודרך

2

4
ה 127 שקר ישנא צדּיק ורשע יבאיש ויחפיר:
6
7 ישׁ מתעשר ואין כל מתרושש והון רב:
8


- • . בזרון יחן מצהד ואת ובועצם חכמה:

וז הון
12 תוּחֶלת מטְשכה מחלה לב ועץ חיים תגָוה באה:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ועלבר שצֵּו אכורי: } \\
& \text { צורע צדְקה שׂכר אמת: } \\
& \text { ומבדף רעה למותו: } \\
& \text { ורצונו תמימי דרך: } \\
& \text { וזרע צדייקים נמלט: } \\
& \text { צהשה יפה וסָרת טעם: } \\
& \text { תקות רשעים עברח: } \\
& \text { וחששׁך מצשׁר אך למחסור: } \\
& \text { ומרוה גם הוה יוראו } \\
& \text { וברָכה לואש משביר: } \\
& \text { ודרש. רעה תבואגנ: }
\end{aligned}
$$

וכבֵלְה צדּיקים יפרחו:
ועבד הויל לחכם לב:
זלקח נפשות חכם: אֵּ בי רשע וחוטה:

ושוֹנצ תוּבֵּת בער: ואיש מ!מות ירשיע: וֹשׁׂר צדיקים בל יעום:

וברָקקב בעצמותיו מבִישה:
תחקּקּלות רשעׁים מִרמה: ופע ישוּים יצילם: ובית צדייקים יעמד: ונעוּה לב יהה לבוז:

ממתכבד וחסר לחם:
זרחמי רשעים אפזרי:
ומבֵרדּ ריקים חסר לב:
 ויֵַּת מצִּרה צדּיק: וגמול ידי אדם יששוּב לו:

II,17 גמל נפשו אֵּש חסד
88 רשע עושׂה פעלת שקר
19 קוערה צדֶקה לחיים
ב תועבת הדוה עישקי לב
21 21
22 צום והב באףף חוּר
23
24 יש מפַּר ונוסף עוד כה נפש בקָכה תדּשׁ 26 27 ששחר טוב יבּקשׁ רצון

28
29 עוֹכר ביתו ינחל רוח
ל פרי צדיק עי חים
31
22, 2 2וב ופ'ק רצון טיהוה 3 לה יפּוֹן אדם ברשע

4 צֵשת חַּל עטֵרת בעלח
ת מחשבות צדייקים משפט
6 דברי רשעים אֶקב־דם 7 7 הפוך רשעים ואינם
8 לפי שִּבְלו יהּלל איש
9
י ידדע צדיק נפש בהמתו
I1 עובד אדמתו ישבע לתם
. ................. ${ }^{12}$

14 מפרי פי איש ישבעם

10,23 בשׂחוק לבטיל עשוֹת ופה וחתבמה לא׳שׁ תבונה:
 וצדיק "סדד עולם:
כה כעבור סופה ואין רשע

ושׂוּ

: ומחּ
: ורשׁ"

צילשון סיתהקפות בתפררת:
ואבן שִִלמה רצונו:

וֹה ת
 וצדקקה תצּיל ממוֹת:
 ובהַות שֵגדים יֶכבדן:

ותוחתֶלת אונים אבדהּ:
ויבא רשע תחתוּ:
ובדעת צדיקים יֵחלצו:
ובאבּ רששעים רִפה:
ובפּ רשעים תַתרם:
: וּ ונאמן רוח מכַמה דבר :

ותשועה ברב ייעץ:

:
וּ ィ
 28 תוֹחֶלת צדיקים שמשחה
 ל צלדיק לעולם בל יםוט בוט 32b.31a的

אI, טאאני טךמה תועבת יהוה
2 בא ודון ויבא קלין
3 4 זה צִדקת תמּם תִּשׁ דרצו 6 צדקת ישרים תצילם 7 יבמות ארםם תאבד תמוד

8 צדיק מצָּה נחֵלץ
9 בפה חנֵף יששחתת רעהּ
, בשוב צדּיקים חעלץ קריה 14 בּרךכת ישרים תרום קרת

12 13

14 באטן תחבְלוח יפל עם
 16b.a

16d.c
 17
 19

ושבע תועבם ת נפשו:
ויוַיַים שׁפכות דם נקי: רגלַים ממַהרות לרוּ לרצ לעה: ומשֵׁלח מדנים בין צארים:

## משלי שלמה

א 10 בן חכם ישַׁמח אב ובן בסיל תוגת אםו:
2


נרדם בקציר בן בֵביש:
יופי רשעים יכֶפה חמם:
ושם רשעים ירקב:
ואויל שׂמתַים הלּבט:
ומעקשש דרפיו דּדָּד:
: 1
ופי רשעים יכַסה חמם:
ועל בל טשעים תבַסה אהצה:
 ופּי אוּיל מחֻתה קרבה:

מחֵתּת דלֹים רִישם: תבואת רשעע לחשָּאת:

ועֹזֹב תוכַחת מַתְעה:
ומוִֵֹא דִבּה דוּא כםיל:
וחושׂך שׂמתיו משׂילי:
לת רשעים זכמעט: ואוילים בחסר לב 'מותו:

ולא ייוִף עָצב עם שה:
ה אֹגר בבקִץ בן משׁכיל

6 7 וָכר צדיק לברֶכה

8 חכם לב יקח מצְּות
9 הולך בתּט ילך כָּטח

- קרץ עין יהּן עצבת

II מקור חיים פי צדיק
22 שִׁנְהּ תערר מדנים
314 בשִׁתי נבון תמצצא חכמה 14 חנבמים יצפנו דעת

שו דון עשׁר קרִית עמ 16 פעִלת צדּיק לחיים

17 ארח לחיים שומר טוסר
18 מכַַםה שִׁנְאה שׂמתי שקר
19 ברב דברים לא יח יחדל פשע ב כסף נבחר לשון צדיק 21 ששפתי צדיק ״רעו רבּים

22 בִּרְכת יהוה היא תעשיר

לשמר מוזות טתחי:
 פל משטׁנהּ אהבו מות:
: : : ח חוח לע וּשתו «: กม่ า


: על בסֵּא מרעי קרת: המישרים ארחותם:
 ולחם סתרים ינעם: בעמקי שאול קראֵדֶ:

8,34c.b לשקד על דלתחי יום יום
 36

 3

4 ה לכו לחמםו בלחמי 6 11


ה"מֻּ ת 13 14 7า7 " 16 17 18

## c9 ed

תקעחָ לזר כבּד

לך התרפם ורחב רעיך: ותנומה לעםעַפיך: צכצפור מיד יקוש:

ראֵה דרכיהֶ וחכם: תכין בקי"ץ לחמהדי": מתֵת תקום משׁׁנתך: טעט חִּק יִִּם לשכב: ומחטוֹך באיש מגן:

הולך עיק שצות פהו: מרד באצבעֹתיו:
בכל עת עדנים ישֵׁלח: פֶתע ישבר וּאין טרפֵא:

6,x בני אם ערבּ תְ לרעד 2 3

4 ח חונצל בצבי טקטח

6
8.7 9 טעע שׁׁנֵות טעעם תנומות 11

12 13 ער תוּ שו על בן פתהם יבוא אידו

- Nranas


וֹהַקשׁבוּ לאמרי פיּ


ועצֵמים כל הרגגיהָ: לירדות אל חדרי טות:

7,24 ועתה בנים שִׁמעו לי
 26 כי רבּים חללים הפילה 27 דרכי שאול >דרכי ביתח

שמעו מוםר צחכמוז: < [ואשרי דרכַי ישמרו:]

א,8 הלא חכמה תקרא
2 בראש מרמים עלי דרך
3
4 אליכם האישים המראו
ה הבינו פתֶאים ערמה
6
7 בי אמה יהגה חפּ
8 בצדק בל אמרי פי
9 פְּלם נלחים למֵבין
קחו מוסרק ואו כוּ כסף ו1 בי טובה חכמה מפנינים

12 אני חכמה שבנתי ערמה
12 14 לי עצה ותושיה םו בי מלבים ימלבו 16-בי שׂרים ישוֹרו
 18 עששר וכבוד צתּ
19 טוב פרִיי טַחרוץ ומפז
ב בארח צִדְקה אהּלך 21 להנחיל ההבֵי ישׁ

22 יהוה קנֵני ראשׁית דרכו 23 מעולם נסכתי 24 באין תהמות חוללתתי כה בטרם הרים הָטָבעו 26 עד לא עשטה אר צרץ וחוצות

27 בהכינו שמים שם אמני 28 באַמצוּ שחקים ממעל 29 בשומוֹ לים חקי

ל ואהוה אצלו אמוֹן בון יום יום
ונ טשחוקת בתבּל ארצו

1 [] 1 ל $33^{\text {a }} \cdot 3^{\text {aa }}$


ואל תטטש תורת אמשך：



בהתהלכך חּנחה אתך
והקיצוחת היה תשִׁחדך： מַחלקת לשון נבריה： ואל תקחך בעפגַּדָה： ואשת אیיש נפש יקָדה תצוד： ובנדיו לא תשורפנה： ורגליו לא תמּׁוינה：ם
בי יגוב למַּא נפשוּ：
את כל הון ביתו יתן： משחית נפשו הוא יעשנה： וחרפתו לא תמחד：
ולא יחמול ביום בקם： ולא יאבה עי תֵרבה שחחד：

ומצִותי תצפן אתךך： ותורתי פאישון עיניך： בַּתבֵּם על לוח לבּך： ומדע לבינה תקרא： טנכריה אמריהֶ החליקה：

בעד צשנַבי נשקפתי：
בבנים נער חסר לב：
ודרך ביתחּ יצעד：
באישון לילילה ואפֵלה：
שית זונה ו ．．．．．． בביתחּ לא ישכנו רגליהֶ：

וצֵצל כל פּנּה תארב：
הִגֶוה פניֶָ ותאמר לוּ היום שלמתי נדרי：
לשַׁרר פניך ואמצאחךּ：
 מר אהלים וקגמון： ונתעלסדי באהבים： הלך בדרך טֵרחוק： ליום הכֶּם יבא ביתו：
בחמלק שטתרדָ תדיחנוּ
כמַהר צפור אל פחחד ולא ידע כי בנפשו דוא：

כ，6 בצד בני טצות אביך
בו 21 23

来 来 来 事 来 事 菜 来 22
בשכבך תשמר עליך
24
כוה אל תחמד יפיּה בלבבך 26 בּ יבעד אשׁה וונה ער כבר לחם

27 דיקתחה איש אש בזיקו
28 אם יהּלך אֵיש על הנְחלים ל לא יבודו לגנב
13 וגמצא וلשِّם שבעתים
323
33
3434 בי קנאה חמת גבר לה לא ישצה פני כל פמר
א， 7 בני שמר אמרי
2
3 קישׁבם על אצבעתיד
4 אמדר לחבמה אחרי אמּ
זה לשִׁמרך מֵאשה זרה

נצרדֶ, עי הּא חייך:
ואל תצּשר בדרך רעים:
שִׁוּה טֵעליו ועבר: ונגזלה שנתם אם לא יכשםיםלו: יין חמםים ישתו:
לא ידעו בְּה יכשׁלו: הולך והור עד נבון היום:

לאמרי הַט אונדך:
שָׁמִּם בתוך לבבך: וֹלכל בשרו טִרַפּא:
עי ממגוּ תוצהות חיים:


ועפעַּפּך -יִשִׁרו נגדך: וכל דוכיך יפנו: הָסֵר רגלך פַרע:

לתבונתי הַם אונך:
ודעת :שפפתיך ינצרון: וחלק משמן חכּהּ: חהּה כחרב פּיות:
שאול צעדידֶ, יתמבו: בעו מעגלתהּה לה תדע:

ואה תסורו טֵּאמרי פי: ואל תקרב אל פתח ביתהּ ושנגתיך לאכזרי:
ועצביך . . . . נכרי:
בכלות בשוֹד ושאורך:
ותוכחת באק לגּי: ולמבַמדי לא השּתי אוני: בתוך קהל ועדה:

ונוזלים מתוך בארך: ברחבות פלגי עים: והין לורים אהחך: ושִׁמח מֵּאשת בעוריך:
 ותחַבק חק נכריה: וכל מעגלוֹתי מפַלם: ובחבלי חשאתו יתמך: וברב אוַּלתו יישגוה:

4,13 החוּנק במוּמר אל תֶּרֶק
44 בארח רשעים אל תבא
טו יפרעהדו אל תעבר בו 16 17 פי לחמו לחם רשע
19 דרך רשעים באפֵּה 18 וארח צדיקים כאור גגהד

ב בני לדבבֵי הקשׁבה
21 22 בי חיים הם למצצאיהם
 24
 26 פלֹם מענל רגלך 27 אל תֵּט ימין ושימאול

א, 5, בני לחכמתי הקשיבה ב
3 בי ذפת תטֹפנה שׂפתי זרה
4 ואחריתהּ מרה בֵלענה ה רגלידֶה ירדות ם מות 6 ארח חיים :פּוֹ תפַּלם

7 7 ועתה בנים שמעו לי
 9 פקן תחן לאחֵרים הודך - • פן ישבעבו זרים פחדך 11 ונהמחקּ באחריתך
 31 וללא שמועתי בקיל מורי 14 במעט הייתי בכל רע

טו שתחה עים מבורך 16 17
18 יהי מקורך ברוד 19 אילת אהדבים ויעלת זן ב ולמה תשגה בני בורה 21

22 עוונותיו ילבדנצ4
23 הוא יטות באון מוטר

3．11 מוסר יהוה בגי אל תמאם ואל תמץ בתוכחתו： 12

 וכל חקצים עם לא ישוּו בחים： בשמאולחה עשׁר וכבוד： וכל נתיתותדֶה שלום：
 כונן שֵַים בתבונה： וישחקים ירעפו טל：

בצ＇ר תושיה ומזמה： וחן לגרגרתויך： ורגלך לא תגוףף
ושכבת וערבה שנתך： ומשלאת רשעים בי תבא：

ושמר רגלך מלכד：
בהיות לאל ידחך לעשוֹת： ומחר אתמ ויש אחקך： והוא יושב לבָםח אחףץ： אם לא גמלך רעה： ואל תחתםתר בכל דוכיו： ואת ישרים סדדו：
ונוַה צדייקים יכָּדך：
ולענםهם יחן חן： ובסילים פַרים קלון：

והקששבו לדעת בינה：
תורתי אל תעזבו： רך ויחור לשני אםּי： יתםך דברֵי לבּך： ואל תֵּ מֵאמרי פּ： ובבל קניגָ קנגה בינה： אהבדָה ותצרךּ： תבֵבדך כי תחֵבקנהּ：


ירובו לך שגות חיים： הדרכתיך במעגלי ישר： ואם תרוץ לא תפשל：
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．．．．．．．．．． 21 בני
22 23 7クロク が
 26 כי יהוה יהּה בִִסְלִך

27 אל תמנע טוב מבעליי 28 אל תאמר לביעׁד לך לד ושוב 29 ל אל תראם בע עם אדם חגם 13 צל תקַנא באיש חמס 323 בי תועבת יהוה גלוז
33 מאֵרת יהוה בבית רשע 34 אם לֵלֵצים הוא וליץ לה כבוד חכמים ינחלו

א，4 שִׁמעו בנים מוסר אב
ב בי לקח טוב נתחּ לכם
3
4

7 ר ראשית חכמה קנבה חכמה
6 אל תעובדָ ותשמרך
8 סלםלדה，ותרומטך
9 ת תחן לראשד לןית חן
－ש שִמע בני וקח אמרי
יו בדרך חבמה תריתיך
12

ואידכם כםופד יאתהם: ישׁׁחרֶני ולא ימצאגני: ויראת יהוה לא בחרו: נאצו כל תוכחתי: ומשעצתיהם ישבעו: ושלִות כטילים תצֵבדם: ושאגן מפחד רעה:

ומצוּי תצפן אמחך: תחּטה לבּך לתבונה: לתבונה תחן קולך: וכמטמנים תחפשנה: ודעת אלהים תמצא: מפיו דעת ותבונה:

מגנן להלבי תם:
 ומישרים כל מעגל טוב: ודעת לנפשך ינעם:

תבונה תנצרפכה:
מצאיש מדֶבר תהפְּות: ללכת בדרצי חשץך: גיגילו בתהפבותק: וגלזוים במעגלותם: מנכריה אמריךָ החליקה: ואת ברית אלהיהֶ שכֵחה: ואל רפאים מענלֹתיָָ: ולא ישׂיגו ארחות חיים: וארחות צדיקים תשמר: ותמימים יֶֶתרו בהּ: ובוגדים •׳טחו ממנה:

וממצוּת יצּוֹר לבּך: ושלום יוסיפו לך:
 בעיני אלהזים ואדם:

ואל בינתך אל תשטׁן: והוא יישׁר ארחתיך: :ירא את יהוה וסור שֵּע: וֹשִקןוי לעצמותיץ: ומַראשית כל תבואתך: ותירוש יקביך יפרצו:

1,27 בבא בשאחk
28 או יקראנני ולא אענה
29 תחת עי שנצאו דעת קאלהים ל לא אבו לעצתי
13 ויאכלו מפרי דרכם
32
33 וישמע לי ישכן בטח
2,א בני אם תקח אמִּי 2 2 להקשיב לחכמה אונך
3
4 אם תבקשצה כבסף
זה או תבין יראת יהוה
6 בי יהוה יהן חכמה
7
8 לנצוֹר ארחות משפט
9 צו תבין צדק ומשפט

- בי תבוא חכמה בלבּ

וי מזהה השמר עליד
12 ותהצילך מדרך רע
13 וצזובים ארחות ישר
14 השׂמחים לעשות רע
טו אשר ארחוֹתיהם ימעקישם
16 לדצילך מאשׁה זרה
17 העובת אלוֹף בעוריהָ
81 כי שׁת
9
ב למען תלך בדרך טובים
21 כי ישרים ישכנו ארץ
22 ורשעים מארץ יכרתו
א.3 בני תורתי צל תשבח 2

3 חסד ואמת אל יעזבד
4 ומצה חן ושַׁבל טוב
ה הבּטח אל יהוה בבל לבּד 6 בכל דרכיך דעחה 7 אל תהי חכם בעיניך
8
9 פבּד את יהוה מַהונך




וצאל תטּש תורת אמדך: וענקים לגרגרתיך: אל
נארבה לתיתם": ותמימים כיורדי בור: נמַלּא בתינו שלל:
כים אחד יהיה לקללנו: טנע רגלך טנתיצהתם: בעיני כל בעל כנף: יצפנו לנפשתם:
את נםש בעליי יקח:

8 שמע בני צוסר אביך 9

 12 13
14 ם. ล 17 צפ חצם טורחה הרשׁת 18 19 כן ארחות כל בצעע בצע

ה

22
23

כה ותפרעו כל בל צעת 26 גם אני באידבם אשחק
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\& Professor A. Kuenen who had agreed to do the Book died xii/ro'91.
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[^1]:    

[^2]:    $*\left[\operatorname{In} 15,23^{\text {b }}\right.$ the case is different. -P . H.]

[^3]:    Wemerion -
    $\alpha$ [Ziegler remarks in his translation of Proverbs (Leipzig, 1791) that belongs to Lle $^{\text {; so, too, Dathe (1789). - P. H.] }}$

[^4]:    15

[^5]:    
    a［Pinkuss remarks：Mit deme Verbum Dhe weiss S，so oft es vorkomme，nichts Rechles anzufangen．
    B The Received Text jaben in the preceding line（ 5 ．Job 36，23）seems to be correct；the conjecture hay is very improbable；contrast WELLHAUSEN， Skizen und lowarbilien，jart 6，p．176．Al $=2$ is，of course，impossible；but Bäth－ GEN＇s emendation azלร ye all does not commend itself．J＇erhaps we shoutd read：
     m．－P．H．］

